

## 5. Implications for the CGIAR

### 5.1 Strategic Planning as a Starting Point Towards Managing Change and Organizational Performance

This booklet with its focus on strategic planning can only be a start. The techniques and practices of operational planning and the organization of Centers to reach their targets are other major areas that require conceptualization and adaptation in the light of the CGIAR's dynamic environment. They, with the strategic planning discussed here, represent parts of a whole coherent planning, management and organizational system which must be dovetailed (see Boxes 6 and 7) in order to maintain flexibility in management while not losing the Center's research focus.

Firstly, options for solid operational planning need to be explored in more detail. The aim will be to highlight and reach consensus on methods that will translate the clear focus of the strategy into implications for organizational structure, systems and processes. The major issues which will arise will be different ways of working together in teams; the integration of scientists amongst themselves and with different organizational units; and different ways of communication, self-reflection and feedback in order to move towards fast-adapting, learning organizations. Development of new competencies and knowledge management have to become an integral part of the management and learning system, rather than being ad-hoc ventures or being reduced to information technology and data management.

A fundamental issue for managing change among scientists is performance management. The reward and recognition systems based on published papers, (often bearing the names of one or a few authors) does not at all correspond to the needs of multi-actor collaboration and partnerships required to make a real impact, and may be counterproductive for both partners and the scientists willing to transform their roles. New competencies, distinctly different from those imbued by scientific training, will require conscious development processes and a learning culture.

All these issues deserve to be dealt with systematically. We believe that the approach taken here i.e. to bring

together the experiences of the different Centers and conceptualizing them, has been very effective and created a spirit of joint learning among Centers. Participants in the Workshop expressed the wish that such an approach could be applied to a number of other common challenges in the management among the Centers. Success in managing change in the Centers, the CGIAR and its wider environment will be closely related to the integration of all these requirements in a consistent and coherent management and planning system.

### 5.2 System Requirements

From the foregoing analysis it will be apparent that each of the CGIAR Centers has a common need to assemble knowledge and data on the external environment affecting poverty and development, and agricultural and environmental research. Although each Center will need to extend the analysis in relation to their particular regional, sectoral or commodity mandate, it is recommended that the System as a whole consider the best means through which to assemble and make available the basic data (e.g. demography, Geographical information system(s) (GIS)) based poverty maps, production system and resource distributions) and economic and other political trend analyses. Whilst this should most logically be provided in relation to the CGIAR's impact and review management functions, a centralized service function could also be considered to help provide this type of information to Centers.

The review of case studies of planning by Centers, particularly those involving substantial stakeholder consultations, showed that each cost in the range of US\$150 000 to US\$1 million – which is a heavy investment of core resources for the Centers. We suggest that such planning exercises should be viewed by the donor community as providing opportunities to set the international agenda in various aspects of agricultural research and that such exercises might be more routinely considered for project support. Certainly, to move from Delphi approaches towards the adoption of more quantitative approaches to priority setting usually involves a long term requirement of Centers to

accumulate data, and to conduct trials in various systems to provide useful measures and methods e.g. of adoption rates, measures of resource sustainability under different practices, and tests of the efficacy of chosen indicator systems. However, the Workshop experience showed that each Center which had attempted a major quantitative priority setting exercise at least once found great benefit subsequently in reviewing progress, refining earlier, rule-of-thumb parameters to improve planning and in gauging the rate of change in the external environment. In the move to a more programmatic make up of the CGIAR, room must be found to support individual and collective planning exercises which are required more than ever in times of change, and expected by the External Program and Management Reviews of the Centers conducted on behalf of the CGIAR investors.