

Physical Board Meeting Minutes

6-7 February 2020, IFAD, Rome, Italy

Participants

Co-Chair: David Hegwood (USAID)

Board Members: Fabrizio Moscatelli (BMGF), Bernhard Worm (BMZ), Conrad Rein (EC), Iris Krebber, Chris Penrose-Buckley, Giles Henley (DFID), Oriane Barthélemy (MEFA France), Marco Platzer (IADC Italy), Ron Hartman, Willem Wefers Bettink (IFAD), Ueli Mauderli (SDC).

Transition Task Force Co-Chair – invited guest: Marc Nolting (GIZ)

Platform Secretariat: Jörg Lohmann, Maurizio Navarra, Oliver Hanschke, Manuel Urrutia, Priscilla Sambiani

Apologies: Ammad Bahalim (BMGF), Tristan Armstrong (DFAT), Sanna Liisa (MFA Finland)

Agenda Day 1

1. Welcome and agreement on agenda for the day
2. Review of action points from last Board meeting
3. Budget and finance issues
4. Transition Overview
5. Draft work plan 2020
6. Transition Task Force – Secretariat Recommendations
7. Transition Task Force – Resources Recommendations
8. Transition Task Force – Membership Recommendations
9. Transition Task Force – Working modalities and Priority Activities Recommendations

Agenda Day 2

1. Review of Day 1 decisions and approval of Task Force Recommendations
2. Strategic Plan 2021 – 2025
3. AGA preparation
4. Annual Progress Report 2019 – highlights
5. Co-Chair Election

Day 1	
Agenda Point	Overview, Discussions, Decisions, and Agreements
1. Welcome and agreement on agenda for the day	<p>The Co-Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking IFAD for hosting the meeting and the Secretariat. The meeting should finalize the decisions on the recommendations and help guide the discussion items in the context of preparing the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The Co-Chair reviewed the agenda points for the day and the agenda was agreed upon by the Board without any changes.</p>
2. Review of action points from last Board meeting	<p>The Co-Chair reviewed the previous Board meeting action and decision points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans for Secretariat: IFAD has shared plans for Secretariat in advance for this meeting. 2. Call for Board AGA committee volunteers: This action point will be discussed under this meeting's agenda point 4 of day two. 3. Co-Chair election: This action point will be discussed under this meeting's agenda point 6 of day two (see agenda point 6 of day two).

<p>3. Budget and finance issues</p> <p>(i) Report on finances 2019</p> <p>(ii) Status of 2019 financial contributions</p> <p>(iii) 2020 contributions overview (IFAD)</p>	<p>Note: Board members were provided with detailed supporting documents and a brief PowerPoint presentation regarding agenda item 3.</p> <p>2019 Budget status and operational balance</p> <p>1. Report on finances 2019 - GIZ Secretariat GIZ Secretariat thanked the IFAD Secretariat for their commitment and support during this transition period. The 2019-2020 budget ceiling as was approved was reflected against costs and commitments per accounting status as per December 2019.</p> <p>There have been expenditure lines which had not be foreseen. There are still some outstanding consultant contracts from 2018. There have also been more consultants than originally foreseen because of secretarial staffing gaps. Promotional materials like roll ups and non-staff/staff travel costs are also a bit over than originally expected. The outstanding operational balance to date as per accounting status 31 December is EUR 563.395. This amount is mainly from membership fees. The outstanding budget is meant to implement the annual work plan including supporting working groups.</p> <p>2. Status on 2019 contribution The Secretariat presented an overview that reflected the status and outlook on member contributions regarding member years 2016 to 2019.</p> <p>Regarding 2019, 9 Members have signed contribution agreement formalizing core-funding: Australia-DFAT, BMGF, BMZ, DFID, EC, Finland- MFA, France- MEFA, SDC, USAID. AFDB. IADC has signed and transferred their membership contribution fees for 2020 to IFAD.</p> <p>3. Secretariat Staffing Secretariat staff in in 2020 will be reduced as various responsibilities will be handed down to IFAD towards June 2020. Laura Barrington has moved to Brussels and she sent her best regards and wished the Platform success in their future work. Oliver Hanschke is reducing his communication work to 50%, while Jörg is stepping in as the Secretariat Coordinator with reduced time (80%) and costs. Manuel is leaving the Platform on 14th February for a new position at United Nations University, Bonn. Lucia Wienand, the former office manager retired and Simone Miller, who supported the Platform in terms of accounting and office management services, has moved to another project. Tobias Braun has joined the Secretariat as Contracts and Finance Manager (100%). 2 interns, James and Octavio have left and have been replaced by Sylvia Otieno.</p> <p>The Co-Chair opened the floor for any comments and questions.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>BMZ requested for further elaboration on the SDG2 Roadmap Initiative budget line. The Secretariat clarified that this budget line had been earmarked and has not been spent yet. It is still part of the outstanding operational budget and will be rolled over to IFAD to support meetings of the SDG2 Roadmap group.</p> <p>IFAD welcomed everyone and stated that they are excited to be hosting the Secretariat going forward. IFAD has done a thorough due diligence process including financial scenarios for future prospect in preparation for the transition. There are two factors that guided their decision to take over the Secretariat. The first is SGD2 achievement by 2030, which is currently off-track. The second is the growing recognition of the role played by agriculture in terms of achieving sustainability and rural livelihoods. IFAD feels strongly that agriculture must be part of the solution to address some of the challenges. IFAD highlighted the next imminent challenge for the Platform will be how best to reinvent the direction of the Platform in order to maximize the opportunities going forward. IFAD</p>
---	--



Global Donor Platform
for Rural Development

	<p>also reaffirmed their commitment to the Platform and members, and they will continue working to ensure a successful transition and that the Platform has a secure future.</p> <p>BMZ is grateful to IFAD that a solution was found for the Platform. They are also grateful to GIZ who has hosted the Secretariat over the past 16 years and have elaborated and developed the Platform to its current form. It still believes that an organization like the Platform is needed, but that it is time for a different organisational scenario. BMZ will still be on the Board and will continue to participate and contribute. BMZ sent best regards from Heiko Warnken, who attended the AGA last year.</p> <p>USAID inquired if the surplus accumulated as of end of 2019 will be transferred to IFAD, and whether there will be complications in making the transfer. The Secretariat informed the meeting that part of surplus will support staffing costs until June 2020, and part of it be used in other allocated operational costs pending approval from the Board, including the World Bank Land & Poverty Conference meetings of the Global Donor Working Group on Land and the AGA.</p> <p>EC has been the biggest single donor of the GDPRD 2018/19. In the past 6 months, it has been very active in ensuring that a new host is found by liaising with IFAD, BMZ/Germany, and other EU Member States. EC considers the Platform as a global public good. EC is therefore very grateful that IFAD has agreed to host the Platform from 2020 onwards. To ensure a smooth transition, EC has recently extended its 2-year contract with the GDPRD until the end of June 2020 to support a smooth transition phase from GIZ in Bonn to IFAD in Rome. The remaining available funds of this contract should primarily be used for the work of the thematic working groups and the AGA 2020. At the same time, these funds are considered as the EU's contribution for 2020. A new contract (with IFAD) will be required for the EC's future contributions and will take some time to be prepared (envisaged for early 2021).</p> <p>Co-Chair requested the GIZ Secretariat to provide an overview of the funding streams and how they will be prioritized when they will be preparing a budget for the next 5 months. USAID said their funding does not necessarily have to be spent by the end of June, even though it has been earmarked. GIZ has the flexibility of transferring it to IFAD at the end of June.</p> <p>IFAD asked if there is a possibility to extend the current Secretariat commission at GIZ so that surplus funds are utilized properly. GIZ Secretariat informed the meeting that they need to discuss this matter further with BMZ but emphasized the need of sticking to the transition plans. BMZ would have to discuss internally regarding potential scenarios.</p> <p>IFAD stated they committed to the Platform and will do their best to support the Platform and the members, will invest in ensuring that the Platform has a secure future. IFAD Secretariat IFAD needs funding first for staff. GIZ Secretariat thanked the IFAD Secretariat for their commitment and support during this transition period.</p>
<p>4. Transition Overview</p>	<p>The Co-Chair is grateful to the Secretariat for all their work during the transition process. The process kicked off about a year ago when BMZ put on the table the need to discuss the future of the Platform and the direction it should take. There have been productive discussions over the last 12 months, which have helped position the Platform in a much better place to address issues affecting the agricultural sector.</p> <p>There have been developments on the global stage from the last couple of months that validate the Platform 2.0, e.g., the announcement of the food systems summit, the SDG2 moment by BMZ, etc. There are a lot of opportunities coming up, such as replenishment exercises happening including IFAD and the World Bank. The Platform is in a good place; the Board only needs to make some decisions on how to move forward. This is a transition process, not a point in time. The decisions will carry on in an ongoing process over the next months. We need to be flexible as a group to address the challenges for the Board and as an entire sector.</p>

5. Draft work plan 2020

IFAD Secretariat Coordinator presented the draft 2020 work plan, which was prepared jointly by the IFAD and GIZ Secretariats and was inspired from past work plans. The main highlights include:

- Output 2 - Working groups have not been explicitly mentioned in work plan. A comprehensive discussion will be had in the context of the Strategic Plan 2021-2025 in order to have a common understanding of these groups.
- For Output 4.F, the preparation of a strategic plan, a stock taking analysis is to be undertaken by the IFAD Secretariat and this should inform the next work plan. The IFAD Secretariat will develop a results-based work plan and budget for next year's work plan pending approval of the Board based on clear outputs, outcomes, and indicators.
- Annex - Overview of expected contributions. They will develop a work plan under the assumption that all members will provide their contribution.

GIZ Secretariat stated that IADC's 2020 contribution has already been received by IFAD. The Secretariat gave an overview of various working group activities anticipated to take place between now and AGA:

- The Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL) will be holding three meetings in March at the World Bank Land & Poverty Conference. DFID gave a brief overview of the GDWGL's members, which indicated that the GDWGL is the Platform's flagship working group as many bilateral and multilaterals are involved. GDWGL has proven over the years that if groups are working well, they take a life of their own, which is essential for their longevity. Secretariat support to this working group has been critical.
- NDC Partnership has invited the Secretariat to their workshop on the 16th March at FAO Italy. Secretariat will circulate the email about this, and the Platform is to decide how to best participate in order to keep the momentum.
- SDG2 RoadMap - BMZ asked for clarification about the Platform's work in this context. The Co-Chair stated that the Platform has been supporting the work of the group for more than a year, but that it only became a formal group last year in June. It has a number of work streams, including the Ceres2030 Project, 50X2030 Initiative, Crops to end Hunger. The group has tried to meet at a more senior level to exchange information on some ongoing activities that support the implementation of SDG2.

Discussion

BMZ inquired whether the SDG2 Group is involved in the organization of various initiatives and events such as Ceres 2030. The Co-Chair clarified that the working group is not involved directly in its organization but in increasing the visibility of their efforts within donor communities at more senior levels, and when necessary, trying to provide support.

Co-Chair the results-based work plan is an intriguing idea and as in most organizations, results are always the first thing to think about. Asked to elaborate upon this. IFAD Secretariat explained that they seek to link the work plan with long term results and outputs, as this is missing in previous work plans. They still do not have a clear idea of what this will look like and pointed out the need of figuring out a proper theory of change for the Platform to frame this approach.

Italy suggested the application of a results-based approach to working groups. **IFAD Secretariat** agreed. The GDWGL's work plan gives a good idea of what is they want, milestones, objectives., etc. Results-based work plans will give an idea of what is expected. **BMZ** endorsed a results-based management approached but mentioned that it might be challenging as it needs a lot of resources to design and follow up on the plans. Pointed out the need of being realistic and cautioned on spending a lot of time discussing the framing rather than the content.

Co-Chair asked DFID who prepared the GDWGL work plan. DFID informed the Board that the group's chair and vice chair provided the heavy lifting in terms of vision, content, and engagement with members and the Secretariat provided conceptual support in addition to logistics and management.

	<p>GIZ Secretariat requested Thematic Working Group members take more ownership and responsibility of the operations of the working via the use of their institutional resources to ensure long term viability and sustainability.</p> <p>Co-Chair added that result based work plans could be helpful and could potentially help to attract new members by justifying their participation. At the same time, there is a need to elaborate what those outcomes are. The results need to be Platform results, not individual organization results; therefore, how the results/outputs are articulated will be critical. They need to be specific to the Platform and might force the members to define what the Platform is, which is challenging, but worthwhile.</p> <p>Regarding Thematic Working Groups, the Co-Chair stated that their results will be different. He advised that the Platform should not completely control or micro-manage working groups' activities and work plans. He pointed out the need to figure out whether the Platform should provide services to the working groups or if the working groups should align themselves to objectives of the Platform. There is a need for a deeper discussion on the relationship between the Platform and the working groups, which will begin under subsequent agenda items.</p> <p>IFAD Secretariat recommended that the work of the Thematic Working Groups be made more predictable. A proper planning process is currently missing. There needs to be more evidence on paper so as not to lose overview. They also recommend that all working groups follow similar approaches.</p> <p>MEAF France suggested that work plans be shared with the Board so that they know of their activities. SDC mentioned that work plans should fit in more with general reporting. IADC Italy pointed out the need to see how members who are not participating in working groups could join. EC proposed more visibility of Thematic Working Groups through newsletters and social media.</p>
<p>6. Transition Task Force – Secretariat Recommendations</p>	<p>Task Force Recommendations 1-2</p> <p>Co-Chair thanked the Transition Task Force for their hard work putting together recommendations. The recommendations had been shared earlier with the Board and the Secretariat had not received any no comments or feedback. Several decisions will be taken today and tomorrow under different agenda items that will guide how the Platform can move forward in the context of Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The Secretariat (IFAD and GIZ) presented their Secretariat size and structure recommendations. Some of the decisions including the setting up of the IFAD Secretariat have already been acted upon.</p> <p>Going forward, the size and structure of the IFAD Secretariat will be dictated primarily by the size of the budget and Board decisions. The transition will be in two phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Up to 30 June 2020, the IFAD Secretariat will have 1 coordinator and 1 communications advisor, while deploying IFAD resources for some functions, including interns and admin support to handle contributions, to support to the Platform during the transition period. 2. From 1 July 2020, the Secretariat at IFAD will have some full-time staff members who are integrated into IFAD's structure and would have been exclusively recruited for the Platform, including full time (100%) coordinator, a communications advisor, and admin/financial assistant. <p>The GIZ Secretariat is significantly reduced in terms of staff size, as well as the time commitment. Four people currently remain: coordinator (reduced from 100 to 80%), communications advisor (50%), one contracts and finance manager to finalize with accounting and book keeping (100%),</p>

	<p>and an intern (100%). The policy advisor is leaving on 14 February, but this position will be filled with a short-term consultant.</p> <p>DFID inquired about IFAD'S staffing plans from July 2020, (whether they will be hiring new staff or deploying the old staff). IFAD informed that they do not have a definite answer at the moment, but the positions will be open, and a recruitment process will be undertaken following IFAD procedures.</p> <p>The Board identified 5 principle Secretariat functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordination 2. Programme support 3. Communication 4. Finance and contracts (relying on inhouse services) 5. General administration (relying on inhouse services) <p>Co-Chair asked if two full time dedicated staff is enough and how the compensation for the inhouse services work, adding that these questions could be answered with the budget. IFAD Secretariat responded that costs and the Strategic Plan will be decisive in planning staff. IFAD will use existing functions of IFAD (e.g. handling of membership contribution) to give support to the Platform. Secondly, there is a provision within the legal agreement labelled program support costs that will be used to cater for compensation expenses for the administrative services. IFAD's overhead expenses structure is 8%.</p> <p>IFAD Secretariat informed the meeting that they intend to have the same quantity of staff after July 2020, and the contracting of additional consultants will be done on a case by case basis. They asked for the Board's opinion on whether their proposed structure is clear and realistic, and if it reflects the Platform's vision for the future. The proposed structure and work plan will all based on the assumption that all Board members pay their contributions. Estimated staff costs are to be between 360,000-400,000€.</p> <p>Co-Chair outlined the following points to be agreed upon for Recommendations 1 & 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Secretariat has 5 principle functions 2. IFAD will provide some of these functions through existing inhouse services as well as consultants as necessary 3. Initial IFAD Secretariat structure will include full time equivalent positions for coordination, communications, and administrative support <p>The Board agreed upon Recommendations 1 & 2. See Decision Sheet for full text.</p>
<p>7. Transition Task Force – Resources Recommendations</p>	<p>Transition Task Force Recommendations 3-6</p> <p>Co-Chair highlighted that there is consensus for Recommendation 3 that members' contributions should remain at EUR 50,000 annually.</p> <p>The Board agreed that contributions should remain at 50,000€ annually. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 3 for full text.</p> <p>Co-Chair noted that the IFAD Secretariat shared with the Board a template for 3-year contribution agreements for everybody to review. The three-year contribution template is based on the notion that secured cash-flow will allow for sufficient and effective planning.</p> <p>EC commented that they will need to have a new contract prepared in order to contribute (envisaged for early 2021). USAID stated that 3-year contribution commitments are feasible but would be subject to annual disbursements which cannot be committed to in advance. MEAF</p>

	<p>France commented that 3-year contacts are complicated but are committed to continue with their annual contributions.</p> <p>IFAD Secretariat commented that they prepared the 3-year template to make the Board's life easier. They noted that if the proposal is not feasible, they can adjust it to individual organization's rules and processes to find a solution. IADC suggested that each organisation could verify with their respective headquarters whether this template is possible and report back.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the 3-year contribution template is a recommendation, but not a requirement to contribute. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 4 for full text.</p> <p>IADC raised the question on how to address the use of consultants and how much control the Board wants to exercise over the use of consultants. Co-Chair pointed out that consultants have been an integral part of Platform operations and have been used for many different activities, including supporting working groups, event organisation, and the preparation of topic reports. There is a need to think of potential consultancy functions when making decisions on the recommendations. One idea is that the Board has greater responsibility over the use of the Platform's financial resources.</p> <p>IFAD Secretariat highlighted that a results-oriented work plan would help reflect on the number and type of consultants needed. GIZ Secretariat stated that they are fine with the use of consultants, but the question remains on the extent of Board control/approval, citing a EUR 8,000 in-house limit for direct contracting.</p> <p>IFAD stated that transition costs should be kept low and Board approval should be given on Platform and Thematic Working Group annual work plans and budget. They are flexible on the use of consultants and have a maximum fee of 650 US Dollars/day (ca. EUR 600) for individually recruited consultants. SDC suggested that consultant's terms of reference should be shared with the Board and decisions be made on a no objection basis within a determined amount of time. SDG further suggested that a proposed list of consultants should be circulated every six months and proposed that ad hoc consultants after July should be selected on a no-objection basis.</p> <p>Co-Chair inquired whether core Platform budget should be used for working group consultants, or if the groups should pay themselves. His view is that working groups pay for their own consultants. The Co-Chair clarified that earmarked working group supplementary contributions can be used as the groups see fit, as they are not part of the core Platform contributions. He summarized points of consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of consultants must be identified in Platform & Thematic Working Groups' work plans • The Board will approve working group work plans but not individual contracts • Members should provide supplementary funding for TWGs • Future decision on whether core funding can be used for hiring TWGs consultants <p>DFID commented that linking consultants to Thematic Working Groups' work plans makes sense, as it forces the groups to be more strategic and forward thinking.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the use of consultants should be identified in the both the Platform's and Thematic Working Groups' work plans and that ad hoc consultancies above EUR 5,000 would need to be approved by the Board via no objection. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 5 for full text.</p>
<p>8. Transition Task Force – Membership Recommendations</p>	<p>Transition Task Force Recommendations 7-13</p> <p>Co-Chair stated the need to decide on what defines being a member and what is the significance of being a member. There is consensus that only members who make annual payments should be</p>



	<p>considered members. In the past, there have been paying and non-paying members with the only practical differentiation being that part of AGA was set aside for paying members. The Co-Chair asked if the status-quo should be changed.</p> <p>DFID asked for confirmation if only the paying members can become Chairs of Thematic Working Groups because the value of the land group is that it brings together all relevant actors, and so without FAO (current vice chair) and the World Bank, the value of the group would be reduced. Giving them a chance to lead would be of strategic importance.</p> <p>Co-Chair responded that from his perspective the Board should avoid micro-managing Thematic Working Groups and the Board should ensure that there is a connection between the groups and the Platform. Therefore, he does not see a reason why only paying members should become the Chairs. The Board can find other ways to ensure that there is this connection. The strategic plan should communicate the incentives of being a paying Board member.</p> <p>The Board agreed to not change the status quo and any organization contributing the core contribution of EUR 50,000 per year is a member and is eligible to be a Board member. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 7 for full text.</p> <p>MEAF France inquired about the communications strategy, specifically the use of webinars. The GIZ Secretariat clarified that there is a good outreach with a diverse set of participants, including members of working groups, strategic partners, and external parties. IFAD Secretariat confirmed that they have the necessary technology available to support communication tools. They are working closely with the GIZ Secretariat to review lessons learnt regarding communications and that a communications strategy will be further assessed in context of strategic plan by taking stock and reassessing of all communication tools with a view of shaping a way forward. Communication tools adopted by the IFAD Secretariat will heavily rely on available funding.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the implementation of communications strategy is of high priority for the Platform and will be assessed in the context of the Strategic Plan. See Decision Sheet, Recommendations 8 & 9 for full text.</p> <p>Recommendations 9-13 were finalized on Day 2, agenda item 1. See Decision Sheet, Recommendations 9-13 for full text.</p>
<p>9. Transition Task Force – Working modalities and Priority Activities Recommendations</p>	<p><i>Transition Task Force Recommendations 14-18</i></p> <p>Co-Chair stated that issues around working modalities and priority activities will be captured in the Strategic Plan when it is developed, but that the Board Meeting will provide guidelines for its development.</p> <p>Co-Chair stated that there is Board consensus that the Board wants to continue holding the AGA as it is a very valuable event for the members and an important outreach tool for the Platform’s stakeholder community. There is also consensus that the Thematic Working Groups and the communications strategy, in addition to the AGA, are priority activities.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the Platform’s three priority activities are the AGA, Thematic Working Groups, and the communications strategy, including the use of social media. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 14 for full text.</p> <p>Co-Chair stated that the recommendation to align reporting requirements to the needs of all Board Members stems from the fact that some members, as part of their annual membership fee contribution requirements, need to have report requirements. GIZ Secretariat expressed the need of maintaining the current reporting standards until June 2020 to fulfil outstanding contracts with some donors, and that thereafter the Board can agree on one reporting structure with the IFAD</p>



Secretariat. **Co-Chair** suggested that the IFAD Secretariat prepares a draft reporting template that the Board can approve after individual consultation with their headquarters. **IFAD Secretariat** confirmed that they will share a reporting template with the Board.

The Board agreed that current reporting processes cannot be stopped and will have to be kept until the end of June 2020. The IFAD Secretariat will draft a reporting template to be shared with the Board and discussed at a future Board Meeting. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 17 for full text.

Regarding the commissioning of consultants and studies, the **Co-Chair** stated that although this item should be addressed in the context of the Strategic Plan, as it is in line with the Platform's priorities and activities, a discussion would be useful to provide guidance for the Strategic Plan. Reviews, studies and consultants have been used in the past and there is value to using them, but the Board needs to ensure that any work undertaken is beneficial to the Platform as a whole, and to not individual members. The role of the Board should not be to micro-manage everything but to give general guidance/criteria.

IFAD Secretariat stated that the use of consultants and the studies will be tied to the availability of resources and the Platform's priorities, and that there is a need to make a differentiation between the Platform's core activities (e.g. the AGA) and other supporting activities (studies, consultancies, special events, etc.).

MEAF France stated that in the past, consultants contracted by the Platform had worked for the benefit of the entire Platform (e.g., Nancy White for organizing the AGA, and Maria Lee the 2018 Compendium of Donor Engagement with Rural Youth). Consultants for activities not specified in the Platform's work plan should require approval by the Board. **SDC** stated that in the past, some studies showed a clear value and were appreciated, but there were others in their opinion that were less helpful in leading the Platform's discussion of rural development in a new direction. They also highlighted that there needs to be pluralism regarding topics, and this will help guide on which activities to fund.

IFAD Secretariat commented that it is impossible to pre-empt the gap between the Strategic Plan and work plan. This will necessitate a separate conversation. It is therefore important to develop the work plan on the basis of the overall theory of change set forth in the Strategic Plan.

In line with the discussion on consultants, the **Co-Chair** asked for clarification on why the inclusion of side events was added to the recommendations. **MEAF France** stated that side events tend to be resource and time intensive. **GIZ Secretariat** funding for working group side events has come from both core budget and supplementary funding in the past, depending on if the latter was provided. There is value in the side events, both in terms of advancing the thematic work of the groups but also in advancing the Platform's brand.

Co-Chair summarized the consensus that the of consultants, side events, and studies are beneficial, so long as they fit within the Strategic Plan. **The Board agreed to address the use of consultants, side events, and the commissioning of studies within the context of the strategic plan. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 16 for full text.**

Co-Chair advised that the Board should discuss what types of outputs and products the Platform should produce and asked whether the Platform wants to put out policy position papers or are there different types of products that can be used. **GIZ Secretariat** noted that it has been discussed in the past whether the Platform should become more engaged with senior level representatives from Board members. **IFAD Secretariat** also noted that Platform is more relevant if it acts in the policy arena.

MEAF France noted that informality of the Platform is both a strong asset and a weakness. **EC** sees the Platform as a global hub to welcome input. There is a large value for actors to come together



know each other, to try to align policies, and to exchange information. In this way they also see the Platform as a common public good that is relevant. **SDC** commented that only having knowledge exchange will not have a strong impact on driving global agendas.

Co-Chair welcomed thoughts on how to convene a space for senior level discussion on topics pertinent to the Platform's work, an issue which will require further discussion in the context of the strategic plan. **MEAF France** stated that they value the ability of members to more loosely exchange ideas and have not so strict discussions, as in the G7, but will be difficult to have more strict discussions on policy within the Platform.

IFAD Secretariat encouraged the use of tools that support policy dialogue among members and to ensure that these tools for policy dialogue are strengthened, including the use of internal dialogue. Further emphasized the need of being pragmatic in building a common vocabulary on policy.

BMZ stated that this is an important topic but would need to frame it within the Strategic Plan. **Co-Chair** stated that there have been attempts in the past to catalyse this senior level engagement but that this is something the Board will need to discuss if there is added value in this.

The Board agreed to address the issue of convening senior level official for policy dialogues within the Strategic Plan. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 18 for full text.

Regarding Thematic Working Groups, **DFID** suggested although they have been identified as one of the key activities of the Platform, in order to maintain a sharper discussion, the Platform should at this time only handle three (3) groups financially and administratively. **BMZ** stated that the land group is a key example of what a Thematic Working Group should look like and seconds the idea of focusing on three topics but maintaining the flexibility of starting new groups, if necessary.

Co-Chair summarised the consensus that the Thematic Working Groups are a core function of the Platform but that there needs to be proper oversight of the financial resources, while allowing for the groups to be flexible. Further discussion of how the relationship between the Board and Thematic Working Groups will be considered in the context of the Strategic Plan.

The Board agreed to maintain the Global Donor Working on Land, the SDG2 Roadmap, and Rural Youth Thematic Working Groups for the time being. They also agreed to increase oversight by having each group submit an annual work plan and budget to be considered by the Board. See Decision Sheet, Recommendation 15 for full text.

Day 2	
Agenda Point	Overview, Discussions, Decisions, and Agreements
1. Review of Day 1 decisions and Approval of Task Force Recommendations	<p>Co-Chair and the Board reviewed decisions from yesterday and approved the Transition Task Force Recommendations. See Decision Sheet for the full text of Recommendations 1-18 and accompanying action points.</p>
2. Strategic Plan 2021 – 2025	<p>Co-Chair highlighted the need for a process, including a timeline of associated deliverables of the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The Board agreed that Terms of Reference for the Strategic Plan, which should include TORs for a consultant to spearhead the process, will be developed by the IFAD Secretariat over the next few months and circulated to the Board for approval. This process is to begin in July after the transition of the Secretariat to IFAD is complete.</p>
3. AGA preparation	<p>Co-Chair highlighted the importance of beginning preparatory work for the AGA and encouraged the Board to volunteer for the Board AGA planning committee. USAID is volunteering for the committee.</p> <p>BMZ and GIZ Secretariat proposed that the AGA should be held in June in order to take advantage of currently available transition funds. BMZ stressed the importance of the AGA to not duplicate other international fora or events, such as the SDG2 Moment in Berlin in June. In order to do this, it was proposed that the AGA planning committee, along with a consultant, should develop the AGA theme to complement the current international climate and to provide more visibility for the Platform.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the IFAD Secretariat will provide Board with TORs for an AGA consultant and an AGA roadmap by the end of March.</p> <p>An AGA planning committee (EC, DE and USAID) call will be held on 21 February 2020 15:00-16:00 CET.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the AGA will be held at IFAD on 25-26 June.</p>
4. Annual Progress Report 2019 – highlights	<p>GIZ Secretariat gave a brief presentation of the Annual Progress Report 2019, highlighting the main points.</p> <p>Board accepted the report via no objection.</p>
6. Co-Chair Election	<p>Co-Chair announced that he will be stepping down as Co-Chair in June and that the operations of the Platform will require two (2) Co-Chairs to be fully effective.</p> <p>The matter of the election of Platform Co-Chairs should be decided as soon as possible.</p>

Action Points

Agenda Point	Task	Responsible	Timeline
Day 1, point 3: Budget and finance issues	Provide an overview of the funding streams and how they will be prioritized when they will be preparing a budget for the next 5 months	GIZ Secretariat	ASAP
Day 2, point 2: Strategic Plan 2021-2025	Draft Strategic Plan TORs for the Strategic Plan, including TORs for a consultant. TORs to be circulated to the Board for approval.	IFAD Secretariat	Process to begin in July
Day 2, point 3: AGA Preparation	Provide Board with TORs for an AGA consultant and an AGA roadmap	IFAD Secretariat	End of March
Day 2, point 6: Co-Chair election	Board members to nominate and vote on Co-Chairs	Board members	ASAP