



SCIENCE COUNCIL
CGIAR

Report of the
Second External Program
and Management Review
of the Center for
International Forestry
Research (CIFOR)

January 2007



SCIENCE COUNCIL

CGIAR

Report of the
Second External Program and
Management Review (EPMR) of
the Center for International
Forestry Research
(CIFOR)

Review Panel: Niels Elers Koch (Chair)
Getachew Engida
Rashid Hassan
John A. Parrotta
John M. Strawhorn
Katherine Warner

JANUARY 2007

The Science Council of the CGIAR encourages fair use of this material provided proper citation is made.

Correct citation: CGIAR Science Council (2007) Report of the Second External Program and Management Review of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). Rome, Italy: Science Council Secretariat.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS:

- Extracts from the Summary Record of Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting 2006 (AGM06)
- Science Council Commentary
- Transmittal Letter and CIFOR Response to the Second EPMR
- Transmittal letter and Report of the Panel on the Second CIFOR EPMR



Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

CGIAR Annual General Meeting, 2006 (AGM06)

Agenda Item 6. Evaluation

External Program and Management Review of CIFOR¹

K. Sierra introduced the item by noting the presence at the meeting of the CIFOR EPMR Panel Chair, Niels Elers Koch. The EPMR was previously discussed at SC and ExCo meetings. The floor was opened to discussion.

Discussion:

- Members expressed support for the EPMR recommendations.
- Several Members emphasized the importance of policy research in forestry.
- There was concern expressed on the apparent weakening of forestry research (not only in policy but also in biophysical science research) in many national programs. It was suggested that this be taken into consideration in the development of a new strategy by the Center.
- Members were pleased with the close collaboration between CIFOR and ICRAF, and the issue of a merger between the two Centers was raised.
- Niels Elers Koch pointed out that the panel did not find a case for a CIFOR-ICRAF merger; the two Centers have well defined and distinct missions and have collaborated well, as and when necessary.
- ICRAF Board Chair Andrew Bennett thanked Members for their support. He noted with concern the declining state of national systems and difficulty of implementing research outputs. He cautioned the CGIAR in coming to rapid conclusions with regards to mergers and alignment. He asked that Members pause and look at past efforts and the costs vs. the benefits. He noted efficiencies and alignment already being undertaken through common board member, etc. Discussions along these lines should include the Centers as partners.
- CIFOR DG F. Seymour also pointed out that the process of developing a new strategic plan had already begun, and most concerns raised by the EPMR and the CGIAR would be dealt with in the context of the new plan.
- Discussion about merger and alignment should focus on the entire System and should be discussed in a later agenda item on this topic. A Member added that it was time to reopen the debate about the current structure of the CGIAR. Another Member pointed out the need to learn from past experiences.
- With respect the EPMR meta-analysis, in addition to content, it was suggested the analysis also look at process and the issue of how to handle EPMRs more quickly and efficiently.

¹ Extract from the Summary Record of Proceedings of Annual General Meeting, 6-7 December 2006.

- F.Reifschneider confirmed that the analysis intended to examine content. The analysis can be expanded to include other items brought up in the discussion but would not be ready by May 2007.

Decision:

- The CGIAR endorsed the CIFOR EPMR recommendations and commended the Center for a positive review.
- The EPMR meta-analysis should also examine issues of process and how to get the most out of EPMRs. Terms of reference for the analysis will be reviewed to reflect Membership discussion and a revised timetable will be established. The draft report is expected to be available before ExCo 13.

Science Council of the CGIAR

Commentary to the 2nd EPMR of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

April 2006

The Report of the Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR) of CIFOR was discussed at the Fifth Meeting of the Science Council (SC), held at WARDA, Cotonou, Benin, in the presence of Panel Chair, Dr. Niels Elers Koch, and the Director General of CIFOR, Dr. David Kaimowitz. The SC thanks the Panel Chair and Members for the report, which gives a very positive account of CIFOR's international credibility. The SC notes that the Review has found the Center to be a leading International Forestry Research Center and, as just one example, highlighted the excellent program in the communication of science to major stakeholders. The SC endorses these overall findings.

The report is very positive about the achievements of the research programs and the overall quality of the Center. The SC believes this to be a reasonable assertion and congratulates the Center. However, the SC would have liked to have seen more analytical evidence by the Panel for this conclusion; specifically on the types of outputs produced and on the measure of outcomes and impact. The Panel suggests that the outcomes from the research of CIFOR are different to most other centers in the CGIAR and are difficult to assess. The SC acknowledges that there are methodological issues for assessing impact on the CGIAR targets from policy research (the predominance of the CIFOR agenda) but the SC's view is that in this (i.e. policy research), CIFOR is not unique. A more thorough analysis and documentation of the many achievements of the Center (based for instance in CIFOR's document "Achievements of CIFOR 1998" where recent impacts are reported as mentioned by the Panel) would in the view of the SC been helpful to the Center both for the recognition of those achievements since the last EPMR and as a more rigorous platform from which to develop the strategy for the future.

The Report has 17 recommendations, which for the most part are relevant, feasible to be implemented, and helpful for the Center to improve its performance even further. It seems that in few areas in any, the Panel has observed such shortcomings that a dramatic change would be needed by the Center – the recommendations rather enforce action that the Center has already identified as needing attention, which is reflected in the Center's response. Thus the SC finds the recommendation 1 – 11, 15 and 16 very relevant to the Center's future where implementation is necessary. These deal mainly with priorities and strategy, science quality and relevance, research management, and data management and ownership; some of these are dealt in more depth below. There are other recommendations that in the view of the SC do not have the same or near the same level of importance, nor are they as useful to the Center as are some of the many suggestions in the report. For example the SC questions if it is effective to expect CIFOR to report implementation of something where it is already doing better than other Centers (Recommendation 12 on attracting women candidates to apply for posts, or has limited chances to influence the situation (Recommendation 14 on influencing the funding environment on the CGIAR).

Because, in the SC view the report contains additional insights in the suggestions and in the context of the full report, the SC has sought in this commentary to draw out these additional issues and highlight them along with the most important recommendations.

Priorities and Strategy

Four important recommendations by the Panel deal with the urgency to develop a strategic plan (Recommendation 1), including a sound priority setting process (Recommendation 2) and resource allocation (Recommendation 3) and a clear definition of program objectives (Recommendation 4). Without these the report suggests/eludes that the Center could loose focus in a number of important areas: development vs. research, policy vs. ecological research, regional focus, IPGs vs. local goods. While the SC found the report somewhat vague and inconsistent in the analysis of these issues for example in discussion of the ad hoc approach to priority setting among the programs, the use of restricted/donor driven funds and its effect on the IPG research vs. development activity – the SC endorses the recommendations and the critical nature of them – they are central to the key question on the quality and relevance of the science. The SC notes that the recommendation on the strategy is almost the same as from the 1st CIFOR EPMR and is pleased to note the urgency with which the board will now act to develop a new strategic plan in 2006, when the new DDG is on board. The SC therefore requests that the Center includes in the MTP to be submitted by June 2007 a detailed analysis of the proposed changes from the old to the new strategy and how these are going to be implemented.

Science Quality and Relevance

The SC strongly endorses the recommendation by the Panel to increase the effort for publication of landmark articles in high impact journals used by the global science community (Recommendation 8). The Panel also noted that such publication are likely to come from the integration of knowledge across disciplines placing more importance on the overall research management and clearer program objectives to implement this recommendation.

The SC also notes in the report some concern about the numbers of regions (5) in the region x thematic matrix, which may compromise scientific focus and lessen interaction across disciplines. The SC notes that a regional matrix system is common to several Centers reviewed in 2006 and in all the Centers concerns were raised about the potential loss of focus in IPG research and on the loss in integration across disciplines (which is the main source of high quality, land mark journal publications) inherent in an over-extended regional matrix system. It is important that these potential high transactions costs do not overwhelm the task of integration at the discipline levels. Thus the SC encourages CIFOR, like other Centers, to think carefully about the optimal number of regional offices and the core scientific staff needed in each in the context of focusing on a clear mandate for generating good quality science capable of generating mission-relevant IPGs. The SC concurs with the Panel about the need for greater clarity in the role of the regional centers (Recommendation 15) and for the Center to identify a smaller set of science based priorities on which it keeps a tight focus and for which the Center will be well recognized by its science peers.

The SC also wishes to underscore the Panel recommendation on research programs (Recommendation 7). In the view of the SC such programs are yet to be fully implemented in many centers yet they are increasingly important in a modern research center based on shorter term funding, collaborative partnerships and mobile staff.

Balance in research focus

The report highlights the strong outcome from the policy research and advocacy over the last few years. The SC endorses this very important achievement. The report also mentions a need for the correct strategic balance among policy and NRM research and advocacy. The SC suggests that CIFOR, while developing its new strategic plan and prioritizing its core research strengths in ecology and policy, expands on identifying an adequate balance between forestry science, policy research and advocacy. This analysis is particularly important to the Center and the CGIAR at large since CIFOR is recognized as playing a leading role in NRM research for the CGIAR system.

Overall the SC endorses the Panel's main recommendations and, as indicated by the Center's response, these will be taken up and contribute to even greater achievements over the next review period. Notwithstanding the overall positive nature of the review, the SC believes that the report would have benefited the Center more by having more in depth analysis behind the recommendations and in few instances more clarity between the recommendations and the context within the main body of the report. Thus this commentary by the SC has endeavored to comment not only on the recommendations but also on some of the additional information embedded in the full report, which we deem useful for the Center.

Finally, the SC looks forwards to seeing responses to the Panel's observations in the 2008-2010 MTP (June 2007 submission), particularly as it relates to: a new strategy; the balance among ecology, policy research and advocacy; key scientific research focus; perhaps fewer regional nodes; and the Center's plans to enhance its presence as the pre-eminent international forestry research Institute.



office address:

Jalan CIFOR, Situ Gede, Sindangbarang, Bogor Barat 16680, INDONESIA

mailing address:

P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB, Jakarta 10065, INDONESIA

tel: +62 (251) 622 622, *fax:* +62 (251) 622 100, *e-mail:* cifor@cgiar.org

April 24, 2006

Dr. Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Chair
CGIAR Science Council

Dr. Francisco Reifschneider
Director
CGIAR Secretariat

Dear Dr. Pinstrup-Andersen and Dr. Reifschneider,

On behalf of the CIFOR Board of Trustees and Management, it is our pleasure to submit our response to the recommendations of the Second External Program and Management Review of the International Center for Forestry Research (CIFOR), attached.

The report is very encouraging to the Board, Management and Staff of CIFOR in its endorsement of CIFOR as a leading international forest research Center, in its recognition of the relevance and credible high quality of the Center's research, and in its acknowledgement of CIFOR as a lead CGIAR Center with respect to communication strategies and outreach activities. The report thus provides us with a strong platform from which to further develop our research and communication agenda, with a strong pro-poor approach.

The Panel has made 17 major recommendations, and an equal number of major suggestions. We appreciate that these recommendations and suggestions are clearly aimed at strengthening the research, governance and operations of the Center, an objective which we share. The report also provides some important pointers in terms of developing a new strategy, priority setting, impact pathways and regionalization. In the main, we are pleased to accept and endorse these recommendations, with some explanation.

We express our admiration to the EPMR panel, led by its able chair Dr. Niels Elers Koch, for its professionalism as well as our gratitude for its positive and constructive report. We thank you, the Secretariat and Science Council staff, particularly Sirkka Immonen, for your assistance in ensuring the success of CIFOR's Second EPMR. And we look forward to the discussion of the report with you so that we might further enhance our collective efforts in the interest of forests and people who directly depend on them for their well-being.

With kind regards,

Angela Cropper
Chair, CIFOR Board of Trustees

David Kaimowitz
Director General

CIFOR RESPONSE TO THE 2nd EXTERNAL PROGRAM AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The CIFOR Board and Management take this opportunity to thank the 2nd EPMR Panel for their time, effort and recommendations. Their report comes at a particularly appropriate time in CIFOR's history, as we about to select a new Director General and prepare a new strategy for the center. Throughout, this response is a collective response of the Board and Management unless otherwise noted.

This EPMR report strongly reaffirmed the need for an international center focused on research about how forest policies can reduce poverty and manage forests more sustainably. The center is proud that the report concluded that "CIFOR's research and policy-oriented outcomes are significant and in many cases outstanding", our communications strategy is "very successful and could serve as a model for other CGIAR centers", and the center "conducts its research through appropriate partnerships". We note the report generally endorsed CIFOR's current strategic vision and work program. We are also satisfied to see the EPMR Panel found CIFOR's management processes are generally "logical, thorough, appropriate to the business and programmatic needs, inclusive, flexible, adaptive, and transparent" and CIFOR's Board of Trustees "exemplifies the expression 'high performing board'".

CIFOR concurs with the EPMR Panel's conclusions that two of the center's highest priorities going forward are to formulate a new strategy and to clarify and successfully implement CIFOR's recently-adopted approach to regionalization. In our view the Panel's recommendations and suggestions are very useful and the center will implement most of them. This should allow us to improve our mechanisms for ensuring data quality, setting priorities, and reviewing research proposals. The center's responses to each of the individual recommendations follow.

CIFOR's strategy and priorities

1. The Panel **strongly recommends** that, after the new Director General is in place, a CIFOR strategy be developed through a consultative and participatory process that builds on its current strengths and brings staff and management together with key stakeholders to agree on shared vision, mission, values and strategic goals.

AGREED. It has now been ten years since CIFOR produced its last strategy, and many things in both CIFOR's external environment and internal functioning have changed since that time. No one document adequately summarizes CIFOR's current thinking about strategic issues, and this is an appropriate time for a systematic and inclusive process to define the center's future direction. CIFOR had planned for some time to develop a new strategy but felt it was important to wait for the results of the EPMR before doing the strategy. A participatory process involving staff and external stakeholders will help to ensure that the new strategy has their full understanding and support. CIFOR has already produced a number of strategy documents that can contribute to the new strategy, including program strategies, regional strategies, a communications strategy, and a capacity building strategy. The center has also held a workshop on the main global and regional trends likely to be important for the center in the future. These will be useful inputs to the new strategy, although the center fully expects to re-assess all the material they contain.

2. The Panel **recommends** that as a first step towards a more transparent and systematic priority setting process, CIFOR needs to formally document its current practice better by

developing an integrated framework that consolidates the steps followed at CIFOR for exclusion and inclusion of projects, giving a full description of criteria, quantitative or qualitative scoring and aggregation methods used.

AGREED. CIFOR will formally document its current approach to priority setting, compare that approach with those used by other CGIAR centers, and review options for improving it. The center notes that priority setting within the CGIAR is a complex process that operates at multiple levels, including CG-wide priorities, center-wide priorities identified by the Board of Trustees, EPMRs, CCERs and scoping exercises, management directives on priorities, internal programmatic discussions of priorities, and the priorities of donors that fund restricted projects, and that any approach it comes up with will have to be flexible. CIFOR's new strategy should also provide the basis for its future priority setting exercises.

3. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR review its resource allocation processes in order to use objective information to support the rationale for decisions on quantitative allocations of research funds between Programs and regions, and ensure consistency in resource allocations with the Center's approved strategic priorities and related BOT decisions.

AGREED. CIFOR is committed to increasing its efforts to collect and analyze objective information that can contribute to its decisions about resource allocation to ensure those decisions reflect the Center's strategic priorities and related Board decisions. This recommendation is closely linked to the previous two and the actions to be taken will help to operationalise the new strategy and associated priorities.

4. The Panel **recommends** that the Program objectives be refined jointly rather than individually, in full consultation with major stakeholders and staff, in order to minimize duplication and use effective mechanisms and incentives to enhance synergies among the Programs.

AGREED. CIFOR acknowledges that it is necessary to minimize inappropriate duplication between its three research programs and to identify more effective mechanisms and incentives for increasing the synergies between them. The process of formulating a new strategy, which will be undertaken at a center-wide level and will involve both major stakeholders and staff, will include revisions to the program objectives. At regular intervals, reviews of the programs' objectives and thematic content with stakeholders and staff will help the center to avoid duplication and create synergies. Some thematic overlap between the programs may be desirable, but where it exists CIFOR agrees that it will need to fully clarify the specific role of each program and how the related activities will interact with each other. CIFOR has already taken steps to encourage synergies between the three programs, including the creating of a center-wide Program Advisory Group, encouraging multi-program restricted projects, and replacing week-long annual Program-specific meetings with center-wide meetings. However, CIFOR fully agrees with the Panel that it needs to do more in this area.

5. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR's Programs and Projects, in their diagnosis, design and implementation, increase attention to gender, especially in regard to poverty alleviation.

AGREED. CIFOR is grateful the EPMR panel acknowledged that the center already carries out substantial research related to women and gender, which has produced many useful outputs. In the last two years CIFOR has carried out multiple gender-related activities at the global and national level. However, given the strong global trend towards the feminization of poverty and the particular importance to poor women of fuelwood collection and sale, the collection, processing, and sale of non-timber forest products, and the role of forests in protecting clean water, CIFOR fully agrees that it can and should be doing more. The center acknowledges that it

needs to be more systematic about prioritizing, highlighting, and tracking its work on gender. Specifically, the center commits itself to: doing an inventory of all its existing activities with significant attention to women and gender; ensuring that gender issues get adequate attention in the formulation of CIFOR's new strategy, explicitly incorporating gender considerations into its priority setting, checking all project proposals to make sure they adequately address aspects related to gender, and making greater efforts to highlight and disseminate CIFOR's research on gender.

The quality and relevance of the science undertaken

6. The Panel **recommends** that in the absence of rigorous technical quality review of research proposals by donor or grant agencies, appropriate peer reviews of all proposals/study plans be undertaken prior to approval by Program Directors.

AGREED. CIFOR agrees that it should formalize and seek to improve its approach to reviewing the scientific quality of its research proposals. In implementing this recommendation it will give particular attention to larger proposals.

7. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR establish a policy and develop protocols for research data quality control and assurance to be applied to all of its field research projects.

AGREED. CIFOR will review its current practices regarding how it ensures the quality of its research data and establish an appropriate center-wide policy and associated protocols.

8. The Panel **recommends** that Program Directors and scientists be strongly encouraged that, of the research publication effort aimed at the global forest science community, a greater share be focused on higher-impact refereed journals, rather than publishing in lower impact and non-refereed journals.

AGREED. CIFOR believes in the importance of being strategic and systematic in its efforts to ensure that its research gets published in the venues through which it will have the greatest desired impact. With regard to work designed to influence the global science community, the center will strive harder to publish in more prestigious journals in relevant fields and less in journals that have limited distribution and influence. At the same time CIFOR will continue to try to make sure that a substantial share of its publications are readily available to developing country researchers. That often requires publishing in languages other than English, prioritizing non-commercial journals with wide circulation in developing countries, and publishing in places that allow the material to be down-loaded from the web free-of-charge. CIFOR will also continue to devote substantial energy to producing publications in styles and formats that are most likely to reach and appeal to policymakers and forestry practitioners.

The effectiveness and efficiency of management, including the mechanisms and processes for ensuring quality

9. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR's Board adjust its procedures as necessary to ensure that its Finance and Audit Committee can carefully review the audited financial statements with the External Auditor before consideration by the full Board. The Panel further **recommends** that the Board actively seek to add to its membership someone with substantial accounting and financial management expertise.

AGREED. CIFOR agrees that the Finance and Audit Committee should review the audited financial statements with the External Auditor before the full Board approves them. Therefore the Board will explore cost-effective options for doing so.

CIFOR's Board of Trustees agrees it would be desirable to add someone with the qualifications described in the recommendation and will work to identify and select good candidates who meet those criteria.

10. The Panel **recommends** that in accordance with its Capacity Building Strategy, CIFOR prepare monitoring and evaluation guides for measuring the effectiveness and impact of its capacity building activities, improve capacity building management processes, and that Senior Management increase their commitment to capacity building.

AGREED. The Panel has correctly noted that CIFOR has made less progress on implementing its capacity building strategy than it originally hoped. That is partially, though not entirely, due to lack of resources. The center has also had difficulty reaching agreement internally about the appropriate Terms of Reference for hiring a new staff member for capacity building. The role of capacity building within CIFOR is an issue that should and will get special attention in the formulation of the center's new strategy and in the decisions it makes regarding regional offices. In any case the center is committed to improving the way it handles capacity building activities and its efforts to measure the effectiveness of the capacity building it does. It will also review the roles of the Assistant Director General, Program Directors, and Regional Coordinators with regard to capacity building to ensure each person has a clear and appropriate role.

11. The Panel **recommends** that an internal policy be developed that includes incentives and opportunities to strengthen capacity of its own researchers and support staff.

AGREED. CIFOR agrees this is an important area to revisit, particularly since the size of the institution and the proportion of junior to senior research staff has risen steadily in recent years. CIFOR has sought to give younger staff members opportunities to attend international conferences and meetings, actively participate in the courses organized by the CGIAR Gender & Diversity program and HR-SAS; it has offered courses to improve the writing skills of junior staff members, and has sponsored the participation of various staff members in training courses directly related to their work. The center has also encouraged junior researchers to obtain graduate degrees in various ways, although it does not provide funding for tuition. Given that un-restricted funding is required to finance most of these activities and such funding is becoming increasingly scarce, it is unlikely the center will be able to greatly increase the resources available for this type of activities. Nonetheless, that is all the more reason for the center to have a clear, consistent, and appropriate policy about how to use most effectively the resources it can provide. CIFOR is committed to developing such a policy that will demonstrate management's commitment to staff development (not just training) at all levels, promote informal training and mentoring, ensure that the performance management system encourages development and ensure adequate incentives are in place.

12. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR become more proactive in identifying strong women candidates for future staff vacancies.

AGREED: CIFOR appreciates the panel's recognition that the center already makes active efforts to locate, attract, hire, and retain female staff members. The center participates actively in the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program, regularly uses its databases, and has adopted practically all its suggestions regarding best practices in recruitment. The center regularly uses recruiters and its own managers and staff to identify good female candidates and encourage them to apply, tries to design its advertisements to attract them, makes sure women are represented on its search committees, allows both spouses to work for the center when appropriate positions exist, has a fair amount of flexibility in work arrangements, devotes considerable time during the selection

process to work/life issues, and regularly seeks to identify the reasons why women professionals leave the organization.

However, we agree that even though CIFOR is already above the CGIAR average with regards to the proportion of women professionals we are still not where we need to be. As part of its review of internal training and career development opportunities CIFOR will assess options for career development for more junior women scientists within the organization. It will formalize the existing practice of including women on all interview panels, and will have further discussions with the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program to examine CIFOR's approach to recruitment and suggest areas for improvement. CIFOR's network of partners has yielded good candidates in the past. We will increase our efforts to tap that diverse pool more effectively for women candidates. We will also regularly track our progress and discuss ways to improve it in both CIFOR Board meetings and within CIFOR's Management Group.

13. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR develop a policy and clear standards regarding ownership and archiving of research data. The Panel further **recommends** that CIFOR establish a records management system.

PARTIALLY AGREE. CIFOR already has a clear policy that all data produced by staff and consultants belong to the organization. All staff and consultancy contracts it signs state that. It also has a clear policy regarding the ownership, use, and acknowledgement of all research results emanating from activities CIFOR conducts together with its partners. The center has done a good job of documenting and archiving most of its spatial data through the efforts devoted to producing its Forest Spatial Information Catalog. Much less effort has gone into similar efforts for non-spatial data. The center has also experienced difficulty getting some consultants and staff members to hand over their data when they stop working with us. The center agrees that it needs to review its current staff, Intellectual Property Rights, and data management policies and procedures to adequately ensure all of its research data is properly captured, documented and archived.

CIFOR recognizes that its growing complexity and geographic scope has made it increasingly necessary to establish a more formal system for handling all its institutional documents. At the moment, the center has relatively reliable procedures for tracking and archiving agreements, MOUs, contracts, project proposals, financial records, and certain other documents. However, it would be useful to systematically identify the different types of records CIFOR needs and define a set of center-wide procedures for handling each type. With the help of external expertise, we will develop a records management strategy, with particular emphasis on electronic records management, which will enable us to manage our records (including vital email correspondence) in a way that supports our work routines, operational needs and legal requirements. This will be led jointly by our Corporate Services Division and Information Services Group.

14. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR work with other CGIAR centers, in consultation with the Science Council, to take appropriate measures to institute appropriate modalities for a predictable funding environment for centers.

AGREED. The Panel correctly notes that it is increasingly difficult to set priorities and conduct rigorous strategic research designed to achieve impact under the current funding arrangements. Centers' heavy and growing reliance on restricted projects that last three years or less and inability to get most CGIAR members to pay anywhere near the true full costs of the restricted projects they fund is not compatible with the type, quantity, and quality of outputs CGIAR members and the Science Council expect centers to generate. CIFOR has been able to achieve the

excellent results the EPMR report has acknowledged largely as a result of its previous high proportion of unrestricted funding. Without that, it will be very difficult to sustain these results over time. CIFOR is committed to working with other CGIAR centers and whoever else may be appropriate to try to overcome this fundamental constraint on the center's operations.

Regionalization

15. The Panel **strongly recommends** a further clarification of the objectives of the Regional Offices, the respective roles of Regional Coordinators and Program Directors, and an effort towards harmonization of Program objectives and regional strategies. The Panel further **recommends** that the Regional Coordinators have adequate authority and resources to fulfill their Terms of Reference.

AGREED. Over the last two years CIFOR has taken significant measures designed to: move towards having full-time Regional Coordinators, increase the proportion of its staff based outside headquarters, adapt its research program more closely to the needs of each region, disseminate its results more effectively in priority countries, efficiently administer the resources managed outside its headquarters, and increase the proportion of its funding generated from regionally-based sources. It has tried to do these things while still maintaining its global programs as its central mechanism for making programmatic decisions and supervising scientific staff.

The center is fully aware that this process involves inherent tensions and poses substantial risks for the institution and that many aspects still have to be clarified and worked out. These processes are extremely complex, the measures and hiring of new staff are both very recent and still incomplete. Thus, it is still too early to draw any clear conclusions about the results.

Nonetheless, the Panel is correct that these are among the most pressing institutional issues at CIFOR today and its recommendations reinforce the center's pre-existing commitment to give these issues the highest priority. The Panel's recommendations correctly identify many of the key specific issues that CIFOR needs to address, along with the issue of how to promote effective communication in an institution that is increasingly geographically dispersed. CIFOR is fully committed to reviewing and regularly monitoring all the points the Panel raised in its three recommendations related to regionalization. CIFOR's new strategy will address many of these issues, as will continuing intensive discussions on these topics by CIFOR's Board of Trustees, Management Group, and Program Advisory Group, and staff in the regional offices.

16. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR proactively monitor and evaluate the progress of the regionalization process in order to avoid conflicts among Regional Coordinators, Program Directors, and regionally based staff, and to further assess the feasibility of establishing and maintaining the planned number of Regional Offices.

AGREED. See response to Recommendation 15.

The accomplishments and impact of the Center's research and related activities

17. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR devote more effort in its project and strategic planning to clearly identify and assess impact pathways in ways that are more closely linked to the CGIAR poverty priority and its own objectives.

AGREED. CIFOR will give attention to this in the context of its new strategy. CIFOR has recently hired a new scientist responsible for impact assessment, who will support the efforts to identify

and assess impact pathways. It has also begun to collaborate with IWMI and the World Fish Center on this topic.

24 March 2006

20 March 2006

Dr Per Pinstrup-Andersen
Chair, Science Council (SC)
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)
Division of Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University
305 Savage Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-6301, USA

Dr Francisco Reifschneider
Director
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA

Second External Programme and Management Review of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Dear Drs Pinstrup-Andersen and Reifschneider,

I am pleased to transmit to you, on behalf of the Panel, the Report of the Second External Programme and Management Review (EPMR) of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), headquartered in Indonesia. The Panel reviewed, as requested in our Terms of Reference, CIFOR's research programme, outputs and impacts, as well as its management and governance. The Panel also considered the CGIAR guidelines for all EPMRs and the eight specific strategic issues you instructed it to examine in the case of CIFOR.

The Panel reviewed hundreds of CIFOR, SC and CGIAR documents and reports, examined the Center's personnel, financial and physical resources, and had meetings with a large number of the Center's staff and members of the Board of Trustees individually and collectively. Members of the Panel also visited CIFOR Regional Offices and activities in Latin America and Central Africa. In addition, the Panel met with and made surveys of, and interviews with, stakeholders, donors and Director Generals of the other CGIAR Centers.

Overall the Panel finds that CIFOR is the leading international forest research center within its mandate and that it is highly appreciated for its credible and relevant high-quality research. The Panel also considers CIFOR to be a lead CGIAR Center in terms of communication strategies and effective outreach activities.

The need for effective and influential research and communication about sustainable management of forest and other natural resources with a strong pro-poor approach is beyond measure. Hundreds of millions of poor people rely on forests for their survival. Forests yield everything from food and medicinal plants to fiber and building materials; protection and enhancement of environmental services (soils and water resources, biodiversity, climate and carbon cycles); as well as employment and other socio-economic benefits. There is therefore a great need for an international forest research

institute such as CIFOR to conduct high quality research with its main aim to impact on international, regional and national forest policies to achieve poverty alleviation.

In the eight years since the last EPMR the Center has, in the view of the Panel, made significant progress in making poverty alleviation a central focus in its Programmes. However, since it is 10 years since the last CIFOR strategy was adopted, the Panel strongly recommends that, after the new Director General is in place, a revised CIFOR strategy be developed through a consultative and participatory process that builds on its current strengths and brings staff and management together with key stakeholders to agree on a shared vision, mission, values and strategic goals.

From its inception CIFOR focused on policy issues to enable more 'informed, productive, sustainable and equitable decisions about the management and use of forests'. CIFOR's research has contributed to the development of key international agreements, policies and practices related to forests at global, regional, national, and local levels. This policy focus demands strategies, research activities, partners, and measures of success that are different than those of many other CGIAR Centers that are primarily concerned with on-farm research for improving livestock and crop production. Given the nature and long-term focus of its research, the ways in which its results are likely to find application if successful, the complex interactions between forest and people, the multitude of organizations and agencies involved, and the dynamic and political nature of international forestry it is especially difficult for CIFOR to measure impact directly. Given that fact, the Panel has recommended that CIFOR needs to give even greater attention in its project and strategic planning to clearly identifying and assessing its impact pathways and to making as sure as possible that they are likely to meet the CGIAR's poverty objectives and CIFOR's own objectives.

CIFOR provided outstanding resources for the Panel including documentation, administrative help and time for discussion with any staff member whenever the Panel wished. The official and personal help, hospitality and openness of the Board, the Director General and all of Center staff was remarkable and the Panel members wish to express their sincere thanks for this support.

I wish to thank my fellow Panel members who worked together in a common cause with great enthusiasm, commitment and sense of purpose and humility, and forgave me when I was too demanding. It was a pleasure to work with them. I also wish to thank, on behalf of the Panel, Sirkka Immonen from the SC Secretariat who served as a resource person and supported the Panel throughout the review, and Manny Lantin from the CGIAR Secretariat who helped from a distance and provided valuable input the governance and management components of the review.

Finally all the Panel Members join me in expressing our appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the challenging task of conducting this Review. We do hope our report will be useful to the CGIAR and the SC, and first and foremost to CIFOR and its partners, donors, stakeholders, and mission.

Yours Sincerely,



Niels Elers Koch
Chair, External Programme and Management Review Panel

**CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
SCIENCE COUNCIL AND CGIAR SECRETARIAT**

**Report of the
Second External Program and Management Review
(EPMR) of the
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)**

Review Panel: Niels Elers Koch (Chair)
Getachew Engida
Rashid Hassan
John A. Parrotta
John M. Strawhorn
Katherine Warner

SCIENCE COUNCIL SECRETARIAT

MARCH 2006

CONTENTS

Foreword	xxvii
Summary and recommendations	1
1 Background and context	9
1.1 CIFOR's platform	9
1.2 CIFOR's context	11
2 CIFOR's Agenda	17
2.1 Objectives	17
2.2 Strategy	19
2.3 Follow-up on the first EPMR	28
2.4 Financial framework	30
3 Research and related activities	33
3.1 CIFOR's three research Programs	33
3.2 CIFOR's research projects	38
3.3 CIFOR's capacity building activities in "recipient countries"	45
4 Governance, organization and management	47
4.1 Governance	47
4.2 Financial Management	53
4.3 Management of research and related activities	54
4.4 Special challenges and issues	64
4.5 Organizational structure	68
5 Future directions for cifor	70
5.1 CIFOR's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats	70
5.2 Future directions	71
6 Acknowledgments	73
Annexes	75

FOREWORD

This Report is the Second External Program and Management Review (EPMR-2) of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). The members of the Review Panel and their biobdata are presented in Annex 1. The Review has been managed by the SC Secretariat in close consultation with the CGIAR Secretariat. The Terms of Reference and Guidelines for EPMRs of CGIAR Centers are shown in Annex 2 and 3 respectively. An additional set of Strategic Issues specific to the CIFOR EPMR-2 were given to the Panel by the Science Council (SC) and are provided in Annex 4.

The Panel and Panel members paid visits to CIFOR headquarters in Asia (Bogor, Indonesia) and two Panel members visited CIFOR Regional Offices in Latin America (Brazil) and Central Africa (Cameroon). Due to travel restrictions to Indonesia for two of the Panel members the Main Phase was held in Singapore rather than Bogor. The Itinerary of the Panel is shown in Annex 5. CIFOR has a dispersed staff in Regional Offices and projects in many countries, and it has not been possible to visit or interview all.

The EPMR Panel is specifically charged to assess the following:

- a. The Center 's mission, strategy and priorities in the context of the CGIAR's priorities and strategies;
- b. The quality and relevance of the science undertaken, including the effectiveness and potential impact of the Center's completed and ongoing research;
- c. The effectiveness and efficiency of management, including the mechanisms and processes for ensuring quality; and
- d. The accomplishments and impact of the Center's research and related activities.

The Panel made every effort to conduct the review in an objective and transparent manner with a focus on CIFOR's future and concentrating on strategic issues. With respect to the review process, the Panel relied on a vast amount of information in identifying key issues and concerns, assessing CIFOR performance² and reaching its conclusions and making recommendations. These included:

- extensive documentation provided by CIFOR, the SC and the CGIAR Secretariats including the EPMR-1 report and Center Commissioned Reviews (refer Annex 6)
- briefings given to the Panel by the SC and its Secretariat
- briefings during the initial visit to CIFOR headquarters from the Director General (DG), the senior Program and Management staff, the Board of Trustees (BOT)³
- meetings with Program Directors, individual scientists and staff members in Headquarters and Regional Offices
- surveys of, and interviews with, stakeholders, donors and Director Generals of the other CGIAR Centers

² Being a Center without walls "CIFOR" is to be taken as a collaborative effort including CIFOR partners.

³ The Panel observed an entire Board of Trustees meeting during its first visit to Bogor in November 2005.

- e-mail communication between Panel members and CIFOR staff for clarifications and supplementary information.

Panel members have worked individually and collectively to produce drafts of specific sections of the report. Drafts were shared with the Center for comments and to check for factual accuracy prior to finalization. At the end of the Main Phase, the Panel Chair presented the main findings and recommendations of the Review to CIFOR BOT Chair, management and staff at CIFOR headquarters in Bogor, Indonesia.

The Panel members agree unanimously to all conclusions and recommendations in the report.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background and context

CIFOR was established as a ‘center without walls’ soon after the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro when the world was greatly concerned with massive destruction of tropical forests. CIFOR has benefited from the post-Rio development of international policies, conventions, and processes such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF)⁴, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and adoption of a more conservation-oriented forest policy by the World Bank.

The initial vision of the sustainable use of tropical forests as a way to preserve them has gradually shifted towards one of using forests sustainably as a way to reduce poverty and improve rural people’s health and well-being. Today, CIFOR is the only pro-poor policy-oriented forest research institute in the world with a fully independent and global mandate that focuses primarily on International Public Goods (IPG).

The need for effective and influential research and communication about sustainable management of forest and other natural resources with a strong pro-poor approach is beyond measure. Hundreds of millions of people rely on forests for their survival. CIFOR is considered to be the leading international forest research center within its mandate and is highly appreciated for its credible and relevant high-quality research. CIFOR is also considered to be a lead CGIAR Center in terms of communication strategies and effective outreach activities.

CIFOR’s research has contributed to the development of key international agreements, policies and practices related to forests at global, regional, national, and local levels.

CIFOR is one of the 15 Centers within the CGIAR System, which gives it credibility and greater access to funding and influence. Many multilateral as well as bilateral donors fund CIFOR’s work (see Annex 10). About half CIFOR’s revenue is restricted funding. Ten donors provide some 70% of all funding.

From its inception CIFOR focused on policy issues to enable more ‘informed, productive, sustainable and equitable decisions about the management and use of forests.’ This policy focus demands strategies, research activities, partners, and measures of success that are different than those of many other CGIAR Centers that are primarily concerned with on-farm research for improving livestock and crop production. The Science Council and CGIAR have not always adequately recognized these differences.

Given the nature and long-term focus of its research, the ways in which its results are likely to find application if successful, the complex interactions between forest and people, the multitude of organizations and agencies involved, and the dynamic and political nature of international forestry it is especially difficult for CIFOR to measure impact directly.

⁴ IPF later became the IFF (Intergovernmental Forum on Forests) and then the UNFF (United Nations Forum on Forest).

CIFOR collaborates well with the other CGIAR Centers. It has had the longest and closest collaboration with ICRAF including joint research projects where their mandates overlap. There has been a noticeable increase in collaboration between CIFOR and ICRAF over the last few years due to CIFOR's increasing focus on Africa and a greater appreciation of the complementarity of the two Centers' research agendas.

CIFOR has been very successful in building productive partnerships with a broad range of institutional partners, including national forest and natural resource research centers, NGOs, universities and the Private Sector, international, regional and sub-regional organizations, bilateral and multilateral agencies and advanced research institutions. These partnerships have contributed significantly to CIFOR's ability to mobilize research funding and complementary scientific expertise, and to enhance its scientific quality, output of International Public Goods, impact, and capacity to inform decision-making processes. CIFOR has been particularly successful in its partnerships aimed at informing and influencing global forest policy actors.

However, reflecting the relative weakness of developing countries' forest research institutions, many of CIFOR's partnerships are with individual scientists who may not be in forest research institutions, but in universities, national NGOs, and projects. Through collaborative research with CIFOR, both individual scientists and institutions become part of larger research networks and share in the dissemination of its results. While CIFOR's partnerships have resulted in significant capacity building of *individual* scientists, building *institutional* capacity in partner organizations continues to be a challenge.

Major findings

CIFOR's strategy, priorities, and research quality and relevance

1. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR has made significant progress in making poverty alleviation a central focus in its Programs. [Section 5.1]
2. The Panel **finds** that activities currently in CIFOR's research portfolio are highly relevant to its mission and within the boundaries of its strategic objectives. [5.2.2]
3. The Panel **finds** that the regrouping of CIFOR's research activities to three Programs that are better aligned with its mission and with the CGIAR Priority Areas is an improvement. [4.1.2, 4.2.1, and 4.3]
4. Overall, the Panel **finds** that CIFOR's portfolio includes an appropriate mix of policy relevant natural and social science research. [5.2.1]
5. The Panel **finds** CIFOR's communication strategy to be very successful and could serve as a model for other CGIAR Centers. [4.2.4]
6. The Panel **finds** that while CIFOR's Programs are working with women in some project activities, CIFOR does not conduct sufficient amount of research that is specifically focused on the impact of forest policy and management on poor women. [5.1.4]
7. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR conducts its research through appropriate partnerships and that there are no indications of moving into niches where there are competitive suppliers. [5.2.2]

8. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR's niche relative to the NARS and the NGOs is clear – complementing their work, encouraging research, building networks, and disseminating results. [3.2.2]
9. The Panel **finds** that there is increasing collaboration between CIFOR and ICRAF that attempts to capture the comparative advantages of the respective Centers to create important synergies. As long as the collaboration and the capture of synergies continue, and duplication of work is avoided, the Panel **finds** no reasons for a merger of the two Centers. [3.2.3]
10. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR's past research activities in Indonesia represented an appropriate share of its total portfolio. The Panel also **finds** that given its global mandate and ongoing regionalization, CIFOR's anticipated reduction in research activities in Indonesia is justified. Further, the Panel **finds** that CIFOR generally maintains good cooperation with the Indonesian government, NARS and NGOs. [3.2.4]

The effectiveness and efficiency of management, including the mechanisms and processes for ensuring quality

11. The Panel **finds** CIFOR's management processes to be in general, logical, thorough, appropriate to the programmatic and business needs, inclusive, flexible and adaptive, and transparent. The Panel also **finds** the importance CIFOR management has given to measures aimed at ensuring the quality and integrity of corporate services to be justified, appropriate, and prudent. [6.3.6 and 6.3.7]
12. The Panel **finds** CIFOR's method of organizing and presenting Board materials for its annual meeting a model of clarity and efficiency, which could serve as an example of best practice. The panel also **finds** CIFOR's BOT to exemplify the expression "high-performing board". [6.1.2]
13. The Panel **finds** that the financial affairs of CIFOR are managed prudently and its financial position and condition are relatively strong. [6.2]
14. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR's organizational culture is suitable to its mission. [6.5]
15. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR lacks formal policies, systems, and procedures for the organization and retention of correspondence, institutional documentation, and materials routinely created internally or received from other sources. [6.3.5]
16. The Panel **finds** that capacity building activities are not adequately represented in the CIFOR's Medium-Term Plan as explicit outputs or outcomes for its projects. [5.3]

Regionalization

17. The Panel **finds** the regionalization process a positive step towards linking Projects and Programs to CIFOR's mission and objectives and supporting the CGIAR strategy. However, the Panel also **finds** that the successful implementation may be problematical because of unclear objectives and insufficient resources. [4.2.2.3]
18. The Panel **finds** the increased commitment to Africa and to expand its work in dry forests and woodlands is appropriate. [4.2.2.1]

The accomplishments and impact of the Center's research and related activities

19. The Panel **finds** ample evidence that CIFOR's research and policy-oriented outputs and outcomes are significant and in many cases outstanding, and have in some instances had impact on the formulation of policies and practices. [5.2.4]
20. The Panel **finds** that CIFOR's strategy to focus on indicators that reflect its influence and indirect impact rather than direct impact is reasonable, given the nature and long-term focus of its research, the complex interactions between forest and people, the multitude of organizations and agencies involved, and the dynamic and political nature of international forestry. [4.2.5]

Major recommendations

CIFOR's strategy and priorities

1. The Panel strongly recommends that, after the new Director General is in place, a CIFOR strategy be developed through a consultative and participatory process that builds on its current strengths and brings staff and management together with key stakeholders to agree on a shared vision, mission, values and strategic goals. [4.2]
2. The Panel recommends that as a first step towards a more transparent and systematic priority setting process, CIFOR needs to formally document its current practice better by developing an integrated framework that consolidates the steps followed at CIFOR for exclusion and inclusion of projects, giving a full description of criteria, quantitative or qualitative scoring and aggregation methods used. [5.2.2]
3. The Panel recommends that CIFOR review its resource allocation processes in order to use objective information to support the rationale for decisions on quantitative allocations of its funds between Programs and regions, and ensure consistency in resource allocations with the Center's approved strategic priorities and related BOT decisions. [5.2.2]
4. The Panel recommends that the Program objectives be refined jointly rather than individually, in full consultation with major stakeholders and staff, in order to minimize duplication and use effective mechanisms and incentives to enhance synergies among the Programs. [5.1.4]
5. The Panel recommends that CIFOR's Programs and Projects, in their diagnosis, design and implementation, increase attention to gender, especially in regard to poverty alleviation. [5.1.4]

The quality and relevance of the science undertaken

6. The Panel **recommends** that in the absence of rigorous technical quality review of research proposals by donor or grant agencies, appropriate peer reviews of all proposals/study plans be undertaken prior to approval by Program Directors. [5.2.3]
7. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR establish a policy and develop protocols for research data quality control and assurance to be applied to all of its field research projects. [5.2.3]

8. The Panel **recommends** that Program Directors and scientists be strongly encouraged that, of the research publication effort aimed at the global forest science community, a greater share be focused on higher-impact refereed journals, rather than publishing in lower impact and non-refereed journals. [5.2.4]

The effectiveness and efficiency of management, including the mechanisms and processes for ensuring quality

9. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR's Board adjust its procedures as necessary to ensure that its Finance and Audit Committee can carefully review the audited financial statements with the External Auditor before consideration by the full Board. The Panel further **recommends** that the Board actively seek to add to its membership someone with substantial accounting and financial management expertise. [6.1.1]
10. The Panel **recommends** that in accordance with its Capacity Building Strategy, CIFOR prepare monitoring and evaluation guides for measuring the effectiveness and impact of its capacity building activities, improve capacity building management processes, and that Senior Management increase their commitment to capacity building. [5.3]
11. The Panel **recommends** that an internal policy be developed that includes incentives and opportunities to strengthen capacity of its own researchers and support staff. [6.4.2]
12. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR become more proactive in identifying strong women candidates for future staff vacancies. [6.4.2]
13. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR develop a policy and clear standards regarding ownership and archiving of research data. The Panel further **recommends** that CIFOR establish an institutional records management system. [6.3.5]
14. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR work with other CGIAR Centers, in consultation with the Science Council, to take appropriate measures to institute appropriate modalities for a predictable funding environment for Centers. [4.4 and 6.2.1]

Regionalization

15. The Panel **strongly recommends** a further clarification of the objectives of the Regional Offices, the respective roles of Regional Coordinators and Program Directors, and an effort towards harmonization of Program objectives and regional strategies. The Panel further **recommends** that the Regional Coordinators have requisite involvement and roles, be closely involved in major work processes and information flows, and have adequate authority and resources, to enable them to fulfill their Terms of Reference. [4.2.2.3 and 6.3.4]
16. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR proactively monitor and evaluate the progress of the regionalization process in order to avoid conflicts among Regional Coordinators, Program Directors, and regionally based staff, and to further assess the feasibility of establishing and maintaining the planned number of Regional Offices. [4.2.2.3]

17. The Panel **recommends** that CIFOR devote more effort in its project and strategic planning to clearly identify and assess impact pathways in ways that are more closely linked to the CGIAR poverty priority and its own objectives. [4.2.5]

Major suggestions

1. The Panel **suggests** that the entire Management Team work together on a “pre-strategy” package to be delivered to the incoming Director General. [6.3.7]
2. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR continue to address priority setting in a more comprehensive manner, that includes mapping and prioritizing problems and transforming them into research objectives; identifying and prioritizing target groups and stakeholders; and identifying critical assumptions for success. [4.3]
3. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR invest more in improving its current definition and mapping of pathways to better define milestones and intermediate outcomes for improved monitoring and evaluation of progress towards achieving intended impacts. [4.2.5]
4. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR continue to sharpen its focus on outcomes and impact and invest in generating information on selected impact indicators that measure changes in livelihoods of forest dependent people, changes in forest management practices and land use patterns in target countries and regions. [5.2.4]
5. The Panel **suggests** that the GOV Program revisit and prioritize its research activities based on its goal and the activities’ potential impact on poverty alleviation and the Program’s comparative advantages. [5.1.2]
6. The Panel **suggests** that with its regionalization, CIFOR’s current capacity building strategy be revisited to include an appropriate role for Regional Offices in current and future capacity building activities. [5.3]
7. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR continue to engage in partnerships for development projects in which they can play their appropriate role as providers of high quality scientific and technical information to development projects consistent with CIFOR’s mandate and International Public Goods obligation. [3.2.3 and 4.4]
8. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR’s Board review the Term of Reference for its Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) with a view to align them with the model Audit Committee Terms of Reference contained in the CGIAR best practice guide. The Panel also suggests that the FAC discuss the External Auditor’s work plan in more depth and specify, where necessary, the areas/issues it wishes the External Auditor to explore. Further, the Panel suggests that the FAC introduce, as a regular agenda item, a closed session with the Internal Auditor without the presence of Management, similar to the closed session it currently holds with the External Auditor. [6.1.1]
9. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR’s Board take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that the risk management policy reflects its own collective, carefully considered judgment, and that a mechanism be established for regular discussion of risk management issues at the full Board level. [6.1.1]
10. The Panel **suggests** that, when assessing collaborative processing or shared services aimed at cost reduction, CIFOR Management consider carefully the investment it has

been prepared to accept for high-quality services and effective controls. Compromising either of these could lead to false economies. [6.4.1]

11. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR, WorldFish and IWMI continue to work together to better manage their cooperative services (e.g. a joint project on the future of research libraries and impact assessment). [3.2.3]
12. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR and ICRAF move forward in implementing a stronger alliance as described in the joint paper: “ICRAF and CIFOR: Building on Past Experience for a Stronger Alliance” (Oct. 2005). [3.2.3]
13. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR make more extensive and strategic use of Center Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs). [6.3.3]
14. The Panel **suggests** that the 10-year rule for staff appointments be retained, but that it must continue to have enough flexibility to accommodate exceptional cases and to make clear that it is not an ironclad inevitability. [6.4.2]
15. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR revive its work towards full implementation of the inclusive-workplace approach. [6.4.2]
16. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR’s “Diversity Associates” and Management actively use the resources developed by the CGIAR Gender and Diversity team. [6.4.2]
17. The Panel **suggests** that CIFOR pay particular attention to the following current and emerging issues of special relevance to its future research portfolio: poverty alleviation, globalization, fresh water as a global issue, climate change and its consequences, increasing demands from national forest research and extension services. [7.2]