

GODAN
3rd Annual DONOR MEETING
1 December 2016
Wallingford, UK

Present:

Donors:

Cathie Woteki (Chair)	US Government	
Rachel Lambert	UK Government, DFID	r-lambert@dfid.gov.uk
Chris Addison	CTA	addison@cta.int
Sjoerd Croque	Netherlands Government	s.r.r.croque@minez.nl
Mark Holderness	GFAR	mark.holderness@fao.org
Imma Subirats	FAO	imma.Subirats@fao.org
Andrea Powell	CABI	a.powell@cabi.org

Executive Secretariat:

Andre Laperriere	GODAN Sec.	andre.laperriere@godan.info
Martin Parr	GODAN Sec & CABI	m.parr@cabi.org

Observers & non-voting contributors:

Jaime Adams	US Government	jaime.adams@osec.usda.gov
Sebastian Mhatre	UK Government, DFID	s-mhatre@dfid.gov.uk
Michael Brobbey	GODAN	michael.brobbey@godan.info
Diana Szpotowicz	GODAN	diana.szpotowicz@godan.info
Ruthie Musker	GODAN	ruthie.musker@godan.info
Ben Schaap	GODAN	ben.schaap@godan.info

Summary of Key Decisions:

-GODAN Secretariat to redraft and circulate Governance Paper for approval by the SC in line with suggestions from meeting.
-SC members did not accept the suggestion for a second committee group. The current Donor Group will therefore be henceforth referred to as the 'Donor Steering Committee' or 'Steering Committee'.
-The next Steering Committee meeting to be held in February 2017 (TBC)
-Secretariat may propose substantive experts or non steering committee partners as possible guest contributors to the meeting.
-The SC will be composed of Donors funding ongoing GODAN activities, notwithstanding the size of the contribution; ad hoc donations will not be considered for SC purposes.
-Principle of annual partner consultation restated, either as one or more virtual or physical meetings, with recommendations fed back to the SC
-The GODAN Secretariat should remain an advocacy body and shall not endeavor to fund and manage significant programmes but rather stimulate initiatives within the network.
-As per agreed practice, all documents approved by the SC will be made available online.

Agenda Overview

A brief review of 4 major areas of discussion. These are as follow: -.

1. Discussion on the role and future of the donor steering committee meeting and the overall governance mechanisms.
2. A summary of 2016 GODAN Activities.
3. Proposed plans for calendar 2017
4. Any other business.

Agenda Item 1: GODAN Donor Steering Committee: Historical perspective and next Steps

Key Question -Since its original ToRs and subsequent inception paper, it was foreseen that the GODAN network would grow and hence came the question as to how this evolution translates in its key management structure, (the Donor Group, now called the Steering Committee [SC]).

Important questions / points raised by participants

- Should geographical representation be a criteria for the composition of the SC?
- Should there be representation from the key member groups (Governments, Research, Private Sector, Academia, Civil Society/Farmers)?.
- How can the membership originally envisaged from the steering committee be expanded to include 4 partners from Governments, Academic institutions, Research institution and Private Sector?
- If so then how should these non-donors be selected? Voting? Co-opting?
- What would be the power/authority of non donor members?
- How many non donors should there be? How many donors (as new ones are coming in soon)?
- Should there be a cap on the number of SC members and if so which criteria should be retained?
- Do we need a separate group to handle financial/accountability issues?
- It was reminded that the principle of expanding the SC to include some form of non-donor participation had been there since the beginning of the Secretariat's mandate, and that whatever formula is retained, it should be implemented soon as 2017 is the mid-year of the anticipated (or at least funded) 5 year GODAN horizon.
- The committee's overall goal is accountability is towards all the GODAN network with a special focus on the operation of the Secretariat..
- Financial accountability is already governed through bilateral agreements with each donor; therefore the SC' s accountability is more of an overall orientation/oversight. Meanwhile day-to-day financial control is provided through the mechanisms of the host organisation, and overall programme M&E with DFID.
- The Dutch Government seek to promote an initiative which is explicitly impact and end end-user driven. They feel that this is best secured by involving end users in the decision making of the SC. They expressed disappointment that the SC does not show consensus to change the governance structure at this point. They suggested that initiative cannot be only governed by donors in the longer term, and expressed the opinion that we should plan for a future GODAN where donor commitments have reduced, and instead GODAN exists as an embedded set of principles and

collaborative actions within its stakeholders. Stakeholders should be encouraged to take over direction at a certain moment in the process to allow the GODAN network and the Secretariat functioning at a high level.

- It was suggested in response by CTA that more involvement of members in decision making could also be achieved through virtual platforms and working groups. (This could allow more sustainable governance).

Key conclusions arising from the above

- Donor Group is now called the 'Donor Steering Committee' or 'Steering Committee'. The need for an additional/parallel management structure was not accepted.
- As per its initial conception, a limited number of non donor representatives should be invited on an ad hoc basis to contribute to substantive discussions within the SC. They should be proposed by the Secretariat to the SC members, based on the strategic discussions planned, and on their technical capacity to enhance them. For example Nutrition was mentioned as a possible priority for 2017.
- The expert guests should be there strictly for their expertise; as non donors they will be considered as observers without voting or decision authority.
- Non monetary (in-kind) contributions provided by some donors was acknowledged as a qualification for donor membership
- As long as the SC size remains manageable the size of the monetary contribution given by donors should not be a factor to disqualify them from participating; instead only donors giving ad-hoc contributions should not be included in the SC.
- As for non donors/expert guests, no specific maximum was set (though up to 4 was mentioned); rather it was felt that they should be invited depending on the issues to be discussed and based on their expertise.
- Donor Steering Committee agreed that there is a need to institutionalise/formalise the input and the feedback loops from the partners (~400) into the existing governance structure. The Secretariat agreed to explore this, especially through dialogue with CTA and the Dutch.
- Ownership of the GODAN initiative is to be fostered through partner meetings.

Agenda Item 2 - GODAN Secretariat: A Year in Review 2016

Key Points

- An extensive report of activities undertaken by the Secretariat in 2016 was discussed.
- SC members expressed their satisfaction with the year, underlining the rapid growth of the partnership and the successful Summit held in NYC in September
- On this the report was adopted as submitted.

Key conclusions arising from the above

- The 2016 report was adopted as submitted.

Agenda Item 3 - GODAN Secretariat: Draft 2017 Work plan

Key Points

- The original goals set for 2017 in the 2015 GODAN Secretariat inception paper were restated, the year being defined as the one during which GODAN should maximize its reach/visibility/presence.
- An ambitious list of proposed activities was submitted, including two, (possibly three) high level summits
- The Secretariat was asked whether its current resources/cashflow were sufficient to carry out such an ambitious plan, to which it was responded affirmatively.
- A special emphasis in further developing impact evaluation was suggested, closely working with DFID and other interested parties
- CABI suggested addition of tangible outcomes and outputs expected in 2017 work plan.
- The Secretariat explained that in order to continue to advocate efficiently through its very rapid growth, its strategy is to grow 'Champions' from within the network, individuals that can be good advocates in support to the efforts already carried out by SC and Secretariat members. It was mentioned that in 2016 this formula had been successfully tested and proved successful.
- Finally the Secretariat indicated that the action plan proposed for 2017 was still being fine-tuned based on the conclusions of the Secretariat retreat that concluded the day before the SC meeting.

Key conclusions arising from the above

- The SC expressed its general satisfaction with the proposed plan for 2017 and approved it subject to the above observations.
- Members of SC also indicated a willingness to make efforts to expand GODAN's visibility, through their own channels and networks.

Agenda Item 4 - Other Business**Key Points**

- Suggestion was made that the bi-annual meetings should be a bit closer to one another than was the case in 2016.
- It was proposed that the next SC meeting be held in February, at a date to be confirmed.
- Minutes from the meeting, along with the revised Governance paper will be circulated for approval shortly.

Key conclusions arising from the above

After the SC members concluded the discussions, the Chairperson announced her coming departure and that Jaime Adams will remain the POC for the US Government, for continuity and until further notice. Marks of appreciation were given by all participants to the Chairperson for her most valuable contribution to GODAN since its inception.

On this the meeting was adjourned.