

11th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

**30 March - 1 April 2015
CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor, Indonesia**

END OF MEETING REPORT *(ISPC Secretariat, June 2nd 2015)*

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

Professor Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, welcomed participants to the meeting. She noted that it was a pleasure to be meeting at CIFOR and thanked the CIFOR Director General and his colleagues for the offer and all the arrangements for hosting the meeting.

Dr. Peter Holmgren, CIFOR Director-General, also extended his welcome to participants and noted that there would be an opportunity in the agenda to learn more about the Center, its work on forests and landscapes and how this fits in with the overall CGIAR portfolio. He noted that CIFOR would also be hosting the Fund Council meeting in a few weeks and so he had chosen to make a few general remarks at this time. He said that all Centers had embraced the arrangements for developing CRPs, which was creating more collaboration and had the possibility of developing good programs over time. He thought that the Results Framework (as described in the most recent iteration of the SRF) was a good place to begin and he assured the meeting that Centers were taking serious, concerted action in moving towards a definition of the portfolio and a refreshed set of CRPs and hoped that the timetable for CRP development would be confirmed.

The Chair noted that there was a lot of activity and pressure currently on Centers, programs and their leaders but that she was optimistic about developments. She invited the participation of observers in meeting.

Agenda Item 2. CGIAR update: Reports of the system units

*(i) ISPC: Maggie Gill, Chair of the ISPC, opened the session by updating Council and meeting participants on the activities of the ISPC and major CGIAR events since the last ISPC meeting (Copenhagen, September 2014). She reported on new responsibilities given to the ISPC following from the Fund Council (FC) meeting (Brussels, November 2014). The major of these were four major recommendations in the Mid Term Review (MTR) report relevant to the ISPC mission, namely (Rec. 1) *Develop a clear and focused vision for the CGIAR to guide decisions on priorities and strategy that will achieve expected results. The Working Group will develop the SRF within a clear and focused vision, with proper**

consultation; (Rec. 2) The ISPC should lead a systematic process of prioritization of research areas in order to sharpen CGIAR focus and impact; (Rec. 6) CGIAR should scale-up partnerships capable of tackling mega challenges. After adopting the new SRF and approving new CRPs, the ISPC should organize a global assessment; and (Rec. 9) The Fund Council should elevate ISPC responsibilities to empower it to be more proactive in providing strategic guidance, foresight analyses, and monitoring the quality of ongoing research. The Fund Council authorizes the Chair to establish a task force immediately. On the recent ISPC deliverables, *Gill* announced the publication of the reports of the strategic studies on Biotechnology, and Data, Metrics and Monitoring in the CGIAR, in addition to a recent brief on a post SF-13 workshop on Nutrition. In closing, *Gill* gave an update on the recruitment of four new ISPC Council members (planned for between mid-2015 and early 2016) and announced that an advert for a new Executive Director of the ISPC secretariat would soon be placed, as Peter Gardiner will be retiring from FAO in June/July 2015.

In the discussion, *Peter Holmgren* commented on the grand challenges that should guide CGIAR research - Centers are suggesting that CRPs need to be designed around these challenges and not in competition with the SRF. He also asked a question about the FAO process for recruitment of the Exec Director, and whether the CGIAR system will be represented in the interview panel. *Gill* responded that the panel will have representatives from CGIAR donors and the ISPC Council as well as representatives of the FAO. *Marlene Diekmann* (GIZ) commented on the ISPC science partnerships and questioned what ISPC is doing about development partnerships. *Gill* explained that when ISPC assesses CRP proposals, partnerships are amongst the evaluation criteria, not only for science but also development partnerships. An ISPC study delayed from 2014 on partnerships was currently being undertaken. She added that GFAR has a clear remit within the system to look at the broader partnership area.

(ii) Consortium: *Wayne Powell*, Chief Scientific Officer of the Consortium Office, presented an update from the Consortium focusing on three major issues: SRF development, the second call for CRP proposals and the Genebanks Options paper. *Powell* reported that the CO and GFAR had jointly organized a broad stakeholder consultation on the draft SRF both within and outside the CGIAR. This was implemented in two phases: a first phase which focused on vision, mission, goals, and the niche; and a second phase which focused on “*How well does the CGIAR SRF reflect a good roadmap for effective agricultural research for development*”. He noted that SRF development had benefited from all the voices and feedback that have been received. The Consortium Board (CB) in its last meeting in Mexico has approved the SRF document, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) inclusion of aspirational targets, as per earlier SRF drafts;
- (ii) convey more excitement in the write up by identifying what is new;
- (iii) shorten the document; and
- (iv) identifying nominated focal points for acting on these amendments. The CB also recommended developing a two page flyer that provides an attractive investor friendly document to be used by donors.

On the second call for CRPs, *Powell* remarked that the CB will be invited to authorize the draft guidelines document for the CRP second call after the FC approval of the SRF (April 2015). He reported that recent discussions with Centers, ISPC and Funders indicate a preference for the establishment of portfolio of CRPs designed with appropriate cross-cutting platforms. Agreement on the portfolio will enable a targeted, two-step development and review process with pre-proposal in 2015, followed by full proposals in 2016. He suggested that the “level playing field” concept (governing the contribution of Centers whether or not they would be lead Centers in CRPs) needs to be finalized and incorporated into the final document. The general timeline for the second call will include: designing an SRF-responsive and internally coherent CRP II portfolio (*from the present - June 2015*); Pre-proposal stage and review (*June - Dec 2015*); Full proposal stage and review (*Jan - Nov 2016*); and finally CRP II implementation (of a 10 year portfolio, starting from *January 2017*). *Powell* described the proposed assessment criteria for CRP pre-proposals which will include strategic relevance; potential unintended consequences; scientific quality; comparative advantage; named partners; and lessons learned. The cross-cutting themes to be applied to each CRP Flagship include gender and youth; ‘grand challenges’ in particular climate change; enabling environment, capacity development, intellectual asset management, and open access and data. Additional assessment criteria will be on budget and staff time; governance and management, partnership, interaction with other CRPs, and contribution at the CGIAR-System level. *Powell* suggested that target beneficiaries of CRPs to be described in pre-proposals should include target IDOs and sub-IDOs, target countries, total number of poor smallholders, and other beneficiaries.

On the process for developing the CGIAR Genebanks options paper, *Powell* reported on the organization of an international workshop on the promotion of Public-Private partnerships for Pre-breeding, (2-4 February 2015, Montpellier), which was followed by a second workshop (5-6 February) with genebank managers, CO, Bioversity, Crop Trust and FO. The final document produced amongst these entities, was circulated to Centers, FO and ISPC, before its discussion in the upcoming FC meeting. This document responds to a request from the FC for an analysis of the: “*funding for and management of the CGIAR genebanks, including identifying potential implications in the event of a short fall in the Crop Trust’s target endowment and proposing a plan for submission to the Peer Review Team for its review and input*”. *Due to a shortfall in the endowment continued investment is required from the FC from 2017 to 2021 to support the genebanks*. Three funding options are presented in the paper: (1) minimum international and legal obligations; (2) additional support to collecting, outreach and partnership; and (3) a potentially “game changing” concept for a more ambitious proposal for transforming the genebanks and their use. *Powell* presented a brief overview of the core genebanks activities (Option1), a summary of total funding needs, and contributions from the Crop Trust endowment and CGIAR fund according to Funding Option 1. He also described recommendations and funding Options 2 and 3, which include respectively, Outreach and partnership activities, and new opportunities.

In the discussion, *Tom Tomich* discussed the inclusion of targets and beneficiaries in the CRP pre-proposals, and highlighted the need for ex-ante assessment, to better understand the

opportunity domains, and how the proposals address Grand Challenges. Powell confirmed the need for validation of the targets and plans over the next few months and that an exercise should be undertaken looking at quantitative data for ex-ante analysis. Following-up, *Doug Gollin* stated that targets and numbers are a very limited way of thinking about opportunities in science, especially for activities as basic as breeding. *Powell* agreed with this analysis and confirmed that CGIAR is now in a period with immense scientific opportunities, and needs to develop a balanced portfolio which will allow these new scientific developments to be harnessed. But the system also needs to think about what it will stop doing. He thought that “big data” is also related to this question, since access to data will shape how targets are developed and evaluated. *Takuji Sasaki* asked, in relation to the genebanks option paper, whether the components on pre-breeding are included in CRPs. *Powell* replied that the placement of these activities were still to be decided; likely funding scenarios were recently discussed in the CB meeting in Mexico, as well as the evaluation criteria of the CRP, however, the CB had found it inappropriate to include pre-breeding options prior to consideration by the FC. Alternatively, these could also be a part of a CRP pre-proposal which could come later this year. *Holmgren* discussed the process of SRF development, and thought it was important to be able to explain to the world what CGIAR is doing, and not only the Results Framework. On the CRP second call, he suggested that for the review and priority setting, the competition should be at the flagship level rather than at the whole CRP level. *Powell* confirmed the importance of the flagship level for CRP proposals, and emphasized the need for ample description of their contents in the pre-proposal template (the original guidance note suggested an 8-page FP justification in the template). In response to a question about possible consolidation of CRPs, *Powell* mentioned that the recent funding cutback has real implications for the current portfolio and number and size of CRPs. *Robert Nasi* pointed out that the September version of the SRF included targets, which have disappeared in the current version. *Gollin* suggested the need to think about the general impacts on producers but without thinking about farmers as a separate group of people. Regarding the process for evaluating CRP pre-proposals, he suggested to broaden the way for doing this, not to tie ourselves to a narrow set of indicators and targets, and to trust the ISPC capacity to differentiate between bad proposals (including poor conceptual work). *Maggie Gill* confirmed that the evaluation of pre-proposals will be carried out at the ISPC meeting in September, and CRP leaders will be provided with face-to-face feedback in November.

(iii) Fund Office: *Samy Gaiji*, representing the Fund Office, presented an update on CGIAR progress in three areas: CGIAR Fund Status, upcoming Fund Council 13 meeting (April, Bogor), and plans for 2015-16.

He reported that the CGIAR Fund in 2014 was lower than in 2013; *Gaiji* explained that in 2013 the Fund benefitted due to a series of one-off contributions (e.g. Canada, Japan, Sweden, UK etc.). The Fund Office previously presented a projection of USD873 million for 2014 (as of August 2014), and the final projection presented for 2014 was slightly higher at USD897 million. The Window 1 inflow in 2014 was USD314 million, Window 2 at USD181 million and Window 3 at USD369 million. The Fund balance at the end of 2014 was USD86 million. The Fund continues to enhance disbursement due to more confirmed funding

early in the year compared to previous years, thanks to multi-year agreements signed by several donors (Australia, Belgium, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Denmark, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland, etc.). Gaiji explained that the size of the Fund balance is also reduced compared to previous years, showing a better management of the disbursements and inflows in 2014. He presented a chart which illustrated the percent of W1&2 budget disbursed to the CRPs compared to the elapsed time in the implementation period, and concluded that overall the Fund is trying to match the expected contribution over the lifecycle of each CRP. Gaiji discussed challenges for funding in 2015, which include possible budget cuts from some aid agencies, a reduction in likely additional contributions, and exchange rate fluctuations. He also stressed that some donors are still waiting for the new SRF and, more importantly, the new CRP portfolio. Future resource opportunities may include better focus driven by an accepted SRF, with prioritization and accountability, a compelling research portfolio responding to the aspirations of both donors and doers, and agreement on a set of targets and indicators aligned with the Results Framework, which could help establish a robust monitoring and evaluation mechanism. Gaiji presented the major elements of Agenda the FC-13 meeting (Bogor, April 27-29, 2015) and the timeline for the CRP 2nd call. In closing, Gaiji expressed the appreciation by the FC of the ISPC reviews, and the importance of the independent reviews of the ISPC in the decision-making process (e.g. CRPs, SRF, CRP 2nd call, etc.). He noted the support to the ISPC Council members selection (3 posts in 2016 and 1 post in 2017) being provided by the Fund Office.

In discussion, *Seget Kelemu* discussed the fund status, currency fluctuations and possible mechanisms for mitigating them. *Gollin* asked about the funding scenarios and noted contradiction of having only one third of the funding coming from W1, while CGIAR is engaged in prioritization of the whole research portfolio. *Gaiji* commented that it is hard to know in advance the level of W1/W2 funding unless we know what CRPs we will have, as it also depends on the outcomes of the SRF development process and the new portfolio. *Wayne Powell* confirmed the importance of W1 to provide strategic capacity, but also highlighted the importance of combining W1&2 and W3 to make CRPs more attractive vehicles to donors. *Holmgren* indicated that several Centers are currently pre-financing CRPs from bilateral funding sources, and emphasized the strategic question on W1/W2 CRP funding (about 30% on average across CRPs), which opens the debate on the right level of W1/ W2 in relation to the strategic framework for CGIAR Centers and CRPs.

(iv) IEA. There was no presentation of the IEA activities but a slide provided by the IEA on the schedule of CRP evaluations was projected for the information of the meeting.

Agenda Item 3. Report on the Integrated Systems Research Conference

Kwesi Atta-Krah, Leader of the *Humid Tropics CRP* provided a summary of the conference held recently at IITA, Ibadan and its outcomes, enhanced by a video with contributions from participants. There had been 120 participants from over 30 countries who had addressed the conference themes: the conceptual underpinnings of systems research; integrated systems

improvement and sustainable intensification in practice; partnerships and institutional arrangements for innovation, scaling and impact; foresight in systems research for development impact; and Future directions; how to take systems research forward? In relation to the 2nd cycle portfolio, Atta Krah suggested that systems research would be the “bedrock” within which changes in productivity, livelihoods and NRM could take place; that systems research would function across programs throughout the entire CGIAR chain and that the proper implementation of systems approaches requires changes in mind set, competency enhancement and strengthened strategic partnerships. In relation to the portfolio, there was discussion of how the commodity value chain work might integrate in “system focal areas” (examples were contributions of Dryland cereals and Grain legumes to a Drylands systems program; the RTB program with Humidtropics; and the general introduction of climate smart practices into all research. Similarly, dietary diversification and nutrition cuts across all systems CRPs as well as A4NH. Systems work embraces institutions and governance and there was a need to define the proper contribution of PIM in this respect.

Jeroen Dijkman who had participated in the meeting commented on behalf of the ISPC. He noted that the Conference had reported on an impressive amount of work and had concentrated on opportunities to improve the quality of research and the essentials of the system’s approach. He felt however that the real value added would come from developing programmatic and conceptual coherence through an overarching analysis. There also needed to agree on the big questions to be asked. Certainly there was an opportunity to facilitate a community of practice around AR4D excellence. We need to build the mandate to do this in our chosen locations since a systematic approach has to be linked to systemic capacity. Linking both frontier and the commodity CRPs and finding mechanisms to link the policy aspects of PIM and CCAFS were required. Similarly, foresight studies are conducted in a disparate manner and tended to look at technologies. However we could think of creating a system for dialogue and entering into regional agenda setting. Certainly working in systems one is confronted with trade-offs (not just at farm level but between SLOs and parallel R&D efforts). The essentials of the approach were the capacity to innovate (and perhaps a better definition of this since it is often seen as adoption by farmers), attention to the wider institutional changed agenda, and developing a common narrative.

Tom Tomich asked what the roles of systems programs are in the CGIAR portfolio? He noted that systems research has its own theory but asked if systems programs are really doing systems research? Are we focused on farming systems, knowledge systems, livelihood systems or is it something else? Because of this confusion scaling remains a challenge. And finally what are the systems advantages for place-based research? How might systems programs provide benefits to other types of programs, and vice versa? Certainly we have some hybrid programs across the CGIAR and the basic concepts of a systems approach are intrinsic to discussion of a portfolio. How will it be possible to approach the SLOs and their human welfare outcomes unless we have a systems focus? In discussion, the ISPC was concerned that there was no priority amongst the broad number of issues raised and the sense given is that systems programs are stand-alone endeavours. Further, a proper analysis of complex systems is an input into priority setting and helps identify the points of leverage for

research. The question was asked, in prioritizing places to work, whether established innovation platforms could be used or adapted to work towards other outcome goals e.g. nutrition. The CIFOR DG suggested that systems approaches were not just about farming. There were issues of technology, practice (the systems level), scaling and global implementation. The ideas of “prosperous farming” and “CSA” should be taken forward with a systems view. In response, Kwesi Atta-Krah agreed that at least in the case of Humidtropics they had entered the program from the perspective of an experimental approach applied to farming systems and he agreed that building a higher level analytical framework was required. He further agreed that a common narrative for systems approaches across the CGIAR was necessary. Within a general approach he noted that A4NH had joined in the planning for nutrition outcomes. The consortium CSO agreed that there should be integrated approaches to coupled systems which could allow addressing several outcomes if a suitable experimental framework could be developed. Tom Tomich, in summarizing the discussion, felt that the CGIAR can contribute to such an experimental framework on the basis of the needs of agricultural development and food systems. Place-based research is important and we need to know about the places where we anticipate developing results and impacts. The CGIAR needs to develop a coherent set of place-based programs, including assessing the needs for sentinel sites and long term monitoring and to bring efficiency to stakeholder consultations at all levels of partnership.

Agenda Item 4. Strategic issues for the ISPC

(i) Responding to the Mid-Term Review (Maggie Gill):

a) A discussion of where the ISPC can add value to science quality assessment, foresight and strategic review in the CGIAR: Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, reported that both she and Peter Gardiner had interacted with the ‘Options’ team to clarify the ISPC’s responsibility for science, and to discuss the implications of a future empowerment of the ISPC’s role. She noted that the IEA had also suggested that the ISPC could formally engage in facilitating the discussion of program evaluation at the Fund Council meetings, notwithstanding the role of the FC’s Evaluation and Impact Assessment Committee (EIAC). Questions have also been raised about where ‘partnership’ sits, to which the ISPC has responded that whilst different parts of the system are engaged in partnership-related activities, the ISPC has the specific task to look at the overall role of partnership.

Following from the MTR recommendation, an ISPC-led Task force is being established in reply to the recommendation that the “Fund Council should elevate the ISPC’s responsibilities to empower it to be more proactive in providing strategic guidance, foresight analyses, and monitoring the quality of ongoing research”. The proposed Terms of Reference of the taskforce and the membership were outlined as follows:

- 1) Scope out how expert advisory bodies add value in other research funding organizations, both in terms of science and partnership;

- 2) Summarize what has worked well and what has not worked well in the work of the ISPC from January 2011 to date;
- 3) Comparing the outcomes of the (1) and (2), identify where there are gaps,
- 4) Consider those gaps relative to earlier ‘incarnations’ of science advisory bodies in the CGIAR; and
- 5) Starting from the new SRF and the emerging thoughts of the Governance Options Review team, develop recommendations on how the remit and governance of a ‘more empowered’ ISPC should be specified.

Maggie Gill asked whether there should be a donor representative on the taskforce, or whether any other specific actor group was missing. The Task force will report to the FC and its conclusions are expected towards the end of August 2015.

Peter Holmgren, DG CIFOR, asked what the specific vision is in moving forward towards a more empowered ISPC, and what this vision meant in terms of additional systems’ costs. Maggie Gill responded that the ISPC has already been dealing with a larger remit, and that the extra costs had thus far constituted the payment of extra time for the ISPC’s chair involvement in the SRF. The ‘fixed’ costs of the ISPC are fairly well known in respect of studies. Any additional costs will depend on the modes of working and tasks that will be decided going forward.

Rachel Bedouin, IEA (on skype), commented that the Task force provided a good opportunity to clarify responsibilities in respect of the quality of science. She also mentioned that a more formal relationship with the ISPC would be welcomed by the IEA and stressed the need to look at science quality in a multi-dimensional manner. John McIntire, IFAD, questioned why the Options team was not to look at the integration of the IEA into the ISPC. Rachel Bedouin, IEA, responded that the responsibilities of those involved in policy and priority setting, need to be separated from the responsibilities of those who evaluate the consequences of this. Tom Tomich, ISPC, asked whether the Task force should also investigate whether there are key strategic functions at the systems level that are lacking, and how to build consensus on system-wide resource use.

b) Quality of science in CRP evaluations so far completed. Speaker: Rachel Bedouin, IEA, by Skype: Rachel Bedouin, IEA, presented preliminary observations on matters related to the quality of science in the ongoing CRP evaluations. Final evaluation reports for all IEA and CRP-commissioned evaluations should be available by December 2015. CRP evaluations are carried out using the criteria of Relevance; Efficiency; Effectiveness; Quality of Science; Impact and Sustainability and with special attention to Gender, Partnership and Capacity Development. Within the evaluation criteria, the following programmatic aspects are addressed: Research and development challenges; Coherence of design and portfolio alignment; Quality of science; Comparative advantage; Progress against commitments / likelihood of outcomes; evidence of impacts from past research; Partnerships for effectiveness; and Theory of change.

In respect of the assessment of 'Quality of science', the IEA, drawing from earlier debates of science quality in the CGIAR, has developed a multi-dimensional framework for assessing science quality in the CRPs. The three main dimensions are inputs, processes, and outputs. Quality of science is treated in itself but is eventually always connected to other parts of the assessment, in particular to relevance and effectiveness. The evaluations use a harmonized approach, although tailored to the type of research and adjusted by evaluation teams. In terms of quality of scientists, the evaluations use H-indexes (combines publication volume and citation; commonly used but with known limitations) but also looks at other issues such as allocation of competences, and appropriate skill mix. The evaluations also assess research infrastructure, research data management and research design, quality assessment processes, learning and knowledge management, and the incentives to researchers to pursue Quality of Science. With respect to assessing the quality of outputs, the evaluations do a bibliometric analysis (quantity, venues [grey, peer-reviewed], citations – using suitable comparators, if appropriate), qualitative peer analysis (random sample of publications), the use and downloading of Web-based outputs, and a qualitative assessment of non-publication outputs such as, for example, genetic materials (distribution, traits, breeding process), data, and databases, training modules, tools, and models. The presentation thereafter presented details of the preliminary results on quality of science for the WHEAT, MAIZE, PIM and AAS CRPs, which highlighted the range of approaches and variability in quality - as measured using the approach -and the possible need for the tailoring of the Quality of Science approach chosen in respect of 'commodity' and 'innovation' programs. In all CRP evaluations, ISPC commentaries on the CRP proposals were used as a starting point for the team's assessment.

Jeff Sayer, ISPC, commented that it was good to see that data management is integral to the evaluations, as this particular issue, and the problems related to it, have been highlighted previously by the ISPC. He further indicated that it would be good to have the evaluations also look at research methodologies and research design, which currently seems to be excluded. Rachel Bedouin responded that there is clear need to place more emphasis on CRP data storage and data use, particularly since data is managed at the Centre, rather than at the CRP level. She confirmed that research design is part of the quality assessment at project level. The ISPC next asked whether the evaluations look only at publication indices, or also at other matters, whether the indicators used in the evaluation of pre- and full CRP proposals could not be used in the IEA evaluation templates, and whether scientists that have recently left the programs were also interviewed during the evaluations. Rachel Bedouin, responded that science leadership captures part of the science qualities, and that the evaluation teams also looks at other engagement and partnering. She also agreed that there may be merit in sharing the evaluation templates. Scientists that had left the program are not included in the evaluation. The discussion next highlighted the problems experienced by systems CRPs in recruiting quality staff due to the reluctance of high level staff to locate to the targeted sites. This was a point of contention, however, because Centers rather than CRPs hire people, and Centers do seem to be able to attract quality staff.

John McIntyre, IFAD, commented that IFAD used the OECD DAC system for evaluation¹, and that whilst management replies to an evaluation, it does not get involved in editing the report. He also suggested that in respect of the evaluations' metrics, it would be interesting to compare new entities with extensions of ongoing programs and to compare pre- and post-reform. In terms of the ambition to change policy and institutions, the question of what the CGIAR and the CRPs can realistically do needs to be asked. Rachel Bedouin agreed that it would be interesting to do the proposed comparisons. She further clarified that draft evaluation reports are shared with program management and a reference group for factual checks and comments. Evaluation teams assess the validity of these responses and take them into account in their revisions as they deem appropriate. Management thereafter issues a response to the final evaluation recommendations and action plan.

c) A donor perspective on requirements for CGIAR priority setting: speaker John McIntire, IFAD: John McIntyre, IFAD reported that the revised proposal on the Quantitative modelling of priorities in CGIAR research has been submitted to the President of IFAD for review. The revision has taken all comments received into account. As indicated, the modelling, which is an adaptation of various existing IFPRI models including the IMPACT model, to priority setting, is a proposed input into system-level priority setting. The model will also be able to provide insights into environmental benefits and the economic impact of policy research. The grant proposal will support the further development of the model and the development of scenarios in broad consultation with all stakeholders. The revised working version of the model should be available in August with strong and validated results available by the time of the evaluation of the phase 2 proposals. Priority setting activities at the Center level have been taken into account by IFPRI and incorporated into their models.

d) Portfolio and 2nd call for CRPs:

Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, stated that, noting previous ISPC discussion, it would be useful to think of the portfolio in terms of principles first before delving into the template (principles of what a portfolio might look like as well as principles on judgment of what should be included in a portfolio). She further clarified that the ISPC was truly acting as a facilitator and not the main mover. The ISPC would continue to act as a broker in bringing different parts of the System together starting with the ongoing eleventh meeting of the ISPC, the Working Group meeting beginning the week of April 13th, the two half-day workshops prior to the Fund Council meeting at the end of April and the Meridian group-DG meeting in London from 11-13 May 2015. The principles that have emerged from the SRF suggest a portfolio that is demand-driven, addresses the grand challenges and the four cross-cutting themes, and finally makes the added value of the 'System' more obvious. In terms of what to include in the portfolio, the principles include consideration of performance to date, feedback on Extension Proposals, comparative advantage of the CGIAR and new opportunities.

¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

In the discussion, the issue of lumping versus splitting the CRPs was brought up. Within the cluster of systems CRPs, there does not seem to be enough evidence of comparative or collaborative advantage. Therefore more integrative efforts would be useful. Other principles that need to be taken into account include scientific opportunity and probability of success, costs/investments and timeline. Another issue that is often overlooked relates to alternative approaches (not just agricultural research) as a means of addressing development problems. Additionally, a critical question for research is how to deal with sequencing across the portfolio. It was stressed that while a portfolio of CRPs is needed, it should not be prescriptive. A significant comparative advantage of the CGIAR that goes unnoticed is that the CGIAR can operate “under the radar” in policy and institutional studies and is not bogged down by multilateral arrangements.

Maggie Gill and Wayne Powell then introduced the CRP pre-proposal template. The Chair explained that donors were expecting to see judgment being made on the pre-proposals during the current financial year so that some time would be available for adjustment. The 10-page template (at the CRP level) mentioned in the 2nd call guidance document would contain sections on strategic relevance; evidence of demand; comparative advantage of the CGIAR together with proposed partners in delivering in specified research areas (including lessons learnt from earlier research); strategic fit and relevance of partnerships; stakeholder commitment; leadership, management and governance structure and proposed activities; and management budget. Decisions on what would be supported would be made at the Flagship level (maximum 8 pages per Flagship), and the emphasis would be on science quality; geography; beneficiaries; strategic relevance (including recognition of how unintended consequences will be dealt with) and comparative advantage including lessons learnt from previous research; skills, experience and capacity of proposed Flagship leader to deliver in this research area, including recent publications and evidence of delivery; added value of partners; indicative budget and justification; illustration of how climate change and other grand challenges will be taken into account; key aspects of the relevant enabling environment; and plans and commitment for capacity development. A few cross-cutting optional elements would focus on showing more cohesion at the System level.

Gill further elaborated on the process, in which the ISPC would expect to receive a single pre-proposal for each agreed CRP. The ISPC would then recommend (following evaluation against agreed criteria) to the Fund Council the allocation of pre-proposals to one of four categories: A) Meets all the agreed criteria at both the overall CRP level (in terms of Theory of Change, management proposal, etc.) and in terms of each individual Flagship. CRPs in this category would be invited to proceed to submit a full proposal; B) Meets the agreed criteria at the overall CRP level, but some Flagships would need to be re-worked and resubmitted by the same Flagship teams; C) Meets the agreed criteria at the overall CRP level, but some of the Flagships are viewed as not convincing in terms of CGIAR and/or proposed partners having comparative advantage. In this case CRP lead Center would be asked to seek alternative suppliers for those Flagships; and D) The pre-proposal is considered to be unconvincing and not competitive at overall CRP level and the recommendation would be that an open call (both across the CGIAR and beyond) be made for alternative pre-proposals

for the specified CRP. If any pre-proposals are allocated to category D, this would lead to a different sequencing for those proposals, allowing time for a transition plan to be developed. *Powell* indicated that the process would be iterative and following the pre-proposal phase there would be dialogue and open discussion on the allocated categories.

In discussion, it was pointed out that a section on the CRP hypothesis was missing – it would be important to explicitly describe the problem to be solved as well as the opportunity to be seized. With regards to the number of target beneficiaries at the CRP and Flagship level, it was not considered sensible to propose such numbers without grounding the CRP in real circumstances. A lot of time had been dedicated to thinking about the Theories of Change and putting aspirational numbers on the target beneficiaries undermines the richness of thought and complexity of the causal change.

In the current effort to come up with a more rational portfolio, criteria that would provide a way of capturing synergies among the existing CRPs would be much appreciated. Attention was called to the fact that the CRPs were not starting from scratch –so other factors needed to be weighed; while new innovation was required compared to phase 1, some form of continuity needed to be encapsulated that built on the performance of management of complex programs. It was suggested that a place-based CRP grouping could address the needs of farming systems of a particular region, for example grouping the CRPs Dryland Systems, Dryland Cereals and Grain Legumes had been discussed as an option.

There did not seem to be a consensus on the number of pages for the pre-proposal. Some participants felt that it was not feasible to expect a 50-page proposal in the current timeframe. The same teams that are responsible for pre-proposals are also responsible for the delivery of CRPs and rushing could undermine the CRPs' ability to form partnerships that could help them be more innovative. The ISPC Chair specified that at the pre-proposal stage, the ISPC would be looking at the partnership strategy rather than specific partnerships. Further, one of the lessons learned from the Extension Proposal phase was that it was not possible for the ISPC to comment on the quality of science based on the amount of detail provided. Receiving comprehensive pre-proposals was even more pertinent for phase 2 since a new arrangement of CRPs and a new portfolio was being talked about. Finally, in order to obtain the confidence of the funders, it was crucial to demonstrate that due diligence had been done.

Agenda Item 5. Strategy and Trends in 2015

The session was chaired by ISPC member *Jeff Sayer*, and focused on Spatial Development Initiatives (SDI) and Growth Corridors. Following from discussions held in ISPC-10 in Copenhagen, a background paper has been commissioned by ISPC, to serve as basis for discussion in a workshop involving CGIAR research programs and selected partners and stakeholders involved in SDI. *Sayer* introduced briefly the topic for discussion, by relating SDI issues to the CGIAR operating landscape and the changing research needs, e.g., for addressing agricultural transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa. He noted that 25 million km of

new paved roads are being constructed or planned, with 90% in developing countries, which constitutes a major focus of international financial flows. According to the ISPC strategic study on urbanization and farm size² innovation will spread along transport routes, and the average area per farm is likely to keep falling in Africa and start rising in Asia. As a result, diverse and changing farm systems will present new research challenges. A vast reduction in the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture and a large move out of rural areas³ could possibly lead to a conflict with the commitment to smallholder agriculture as the main route for growth in African agriculture and for poverty reduction. These trends would call for “more realism and not just an exclusive focus on smallholders”. *Sayer* indicated a general tendency of corridors to exclude the poorest and sometimes deepen existing power disparities. He also noted that many governments are currently betting on SDIs and large-scale public-private partnerships to achieve development goals. In Indonesia, roads are going into forests or agro-forests that are becoming very large estates, including significant oil palm estates in the hands of a few families. He concluded that this is not only a terrestrial issue, but that vast pristine areas will become more accessible. On the size of the issue, he mentioned that an Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has been recently capitalized with \$100 billion, and might be headquartered in Jakarta. A similar initiative might also be launched by BRICS countries in Africa. Discussing the next steps for the ISPC study on SDI and corridors, *Sayer* recommended not taking a position for or against corridors, but rather to focus on exploring the implications for CGIAR research. Next steps will include the organization of workshop in Africa (late 2015), to engage dialogue between CRPs, NEPAD/CAADP and stakeholders to reflect on agricultural transitions and likely implication for the CGIAR. *Sayer* closed by introducing the next speaker on the lessons learned from Indonesia.

Bustanul Arifin, Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Lampung and Head of Expert Group for the National Food Security Council (Indonesia) presented a paper titled “*Review of Indonesian Development Corridors: An Inclusion of Agricultural Research*”. He first introduced the future development outlook in Indonesia, based on a study by the McKinsey Global Institute (2012). In 2030, Indonesia is expected to move from the 16th to 7th largest economy in the World, with 135 million middle-class consumers, and 71% of the population living in cities and producing about 86% of the country GDP. *Arifin* reported that the engine of Indonesian economy outside of Java consists mainly in mining, plantation and some service sectors; decentralization and regional autonomy speed up the economic growth although economic inequality has widened in recent years. He proposed that if infrastructure development is targeted outside Java, these regions will become the sources of Indonesia’s economic growth in the near future. But the question is about how to start? He presented an overview and maps of the MP3EI-2025 plan of the Economic Development Corridors, which includes six major corridors in Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Bali-Nusra, and the Papua-Maluku corridor. *Arifin* then described the Government policy for Economic self-reliance, which focuses on food sovereignty supported by food security, and ability to protect and empower the main actors of food system, particularly farmers and fishermen. Maritime

² (*Masters et al. 2013*)

³ (*Collier and Deacon, 2014*)

economy is based on major improvement in infrastructure, ports, vessels, interconnectivity, and logistic systems. Sustainability aims at economically viable, socially acceptable and ecologically sound policy, where public-private partnership is encouraged. Recent data on production of key commodities show a slow productivity growth in strategic foods (rice, maize, soybean, sugar). *Arifin* suggested that the new government would not take risks in the next 5 years, by shifting the basis of strategic food production outside Java; although strengthening the foundation of food production outside Java is much needed in Indonesia. The majority of food-crop farmers (about 54%) are smallholders, with about 50% living in Java. From the 28.6 million poor people in the country, about 63% are farmers. He mentioned that the new government was reinstalling programs of agrarian reforms and spatial planning and development, to increase the farm-holding size and improve the market access. Major public investment has been allocated to build new ports and rehabilitate infrastructure. New approaches to corporate farming and food estates have been developed, especially outside Java, both for area expansion and production intensification to ensure food security in the country. Data on land utilization in Indonesia shows an unbalanced distribution of plantation and forest-land ownership among private companies, landless farmers and smallholders. In his concluding remarks, *Arifin* observed that land-holding size remains problematic for the farmers' welfare, unless agricultural policies are supported by a high quality rural development and agrarian reforms, and by a rapid pace of "upward diversification" from low-to high value local foods, horticulture, and estate crops, etc. The priorities of closing the gap between ideal and actual yield levels will require capacity building of researchers and research institutions. Reducing poverty, combating child malnutrition and preventing its future occurrence requires promotion of food diversification based on local endowments and food technology development. He added that R&D policies should increase budget allocation at least to 1 percent of the GDP, from public funds, SOEs and private sector, and empower food-innovation networks, involving multi-stakeholder partnership.

In discussion, *Doug Gollin* addressed the farm size issue and asked about the subsidy environment for larger farms in Indonesia. *Arifin* recognized the existence of implicit subsidy even for large plantations, such as ease in obtaining land titles and credit subsidy. NGOs are also advocating for smallholder farmers' access to subsidies. *Tom Tomich* commented on jobs and labour market in Java, as it has been complex for a long time, and asked a question on the issue of landlessness and poverty and if and how it has been addressed. *Arifin* referred to figures in the Agricultural Censuses of 2003 and 2013, and concluded that limited farm income is still the big problem for smallholders, as the average income from farming is less than 40% of total income, and farmers have to rely on other sources of livelihood. *Seget Kelemu* discussed the Indonesian policy on food sovereignty and the ambitious targets it has set for future production, and asked about the necessary R&D investments to accompany the policy. *Arifin* replied that the budget of the Ministry of Agriculture had more than doubled this year, but investment is mostly dedicated for infrastructure and mechanization, and not so much into research. In response to a question from an observer about the policy on corridors and the space left for forestry and biodiversity in Indonesia, the speaker replied that partnership is being promoted involving both private sector companies and smallholders, to secure farmers access to market for all products including rice, livestock and rubber, and to

prevent low prices, promote processing and value chains, which should contribute to higher farmers' income. *Holmgren* discussed how the question of farm size and SDI may relate to CGIAR grand challenges, especially for the aspects related to policy domains, nutrition and food security, and finance. In response to a question by *M. Diekmann* (GIZ) on the role for under-utilized crops in Indonesia, *Arifin* reported a tendency towards changing crops, but normally rice is not being replaced, unless land is converted into industrial or urban uses.

Agenda Item 6. CIFOR presentation

Status of tropical forests and how CIFOR and how it fits into the global system: Peter Holmgren (Director General, CIFOR) presented an overview of the Center's work, contextualized in relation to larger social, economic and political developments. With a projected population of 9.5 billion in 2050, increased climate variability, and changing consumption patterns, the world may look very different from today. Hence, the grand challenges for the CGIAR include (1) increasing food production capacity to meet future demand; (2) ensuring that farming is sustainable, and brings prosperity and well-being; (3) improving sustainable diets and health; (4) maintaining stable and trusted food systems; and (5) protecting ecosystems, managing landscapes, and handling climate change. He noted that forests are receiving an unprecedented level of attention as they are fundamental to sustainable development and in achieving all 17 SDGs, with influences on a number of dimensions (food, nutrition and health; water; energy; biodiversity conservation; livelihoods; climate change adaptation etc.). Holmgren also pointed out that the sectoral divide between agriculture and forestry is an imaginary one: that forestry is not fundamentally about trees, but about people. For instance, the 2013 fires in Sumatra (Indonesia) were about clearing forests to make space for oil palm cultivation.

The DG also spoke to the CGIAR's and CIFOR's role in addressing the grand challenges. Scientific research is only one aspect of the work: information dissemination and technology transfer are the two other objectives identified in CIFOR's statute. Bringing about such transfer and dissemination is the challenge for CIFOR (and CGIAR). If one considers the Sumatra fires again, the news cycle lasts about a week (peaks in the number of news items following the peaks in number of fire hotspots): how does one create a lasting impression – in other words, a meaningful science-policy interface? CIFOR is attempting to address this by having science and communications coordinators working together. He proceeded to give examples of innovative forums or partnerships CIFOR has leveraged to address specific challenges: for instance, in June 2015, CIFOR will make an investment case to the finance sector (equity, pension funds etc.) on REDD+ and sustainable land use through a Global Landscapes Forum event in London. Holmgren's presentation ended with a reiteration of CIFOR's role in addressing the several challenges, cautioning that its work is not restricted to SLO-3 (but spans all three SLOs).

The FTA program; achievements, lessons learned and the future (Robert Nasi: CRP leader FTA): Robert Nasi (Deputy Director General-Research and Director, FTA) gave an overview

of the Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry CRP. CGIAR IEA's evaluation found FTA objectives to be highly relevant, especially from the global public goods perspective. The evaluation report had advised several adjustments to ensure that emerging research themes are addressed, forestry issues are better integrated into development agendas, and research priorities are better balanced geographically. He also outlined some of the key outcomes and impacts of FTA: a study of CIFOR and CIRAD's effort in the Congo Basin found that it helped bring about 20 million hectares of concessions under management plans, and forest management plans led to 730,000 tons of carbon sequestered annually in the Basin; a change in legal definition of agroforestry in Peru impacting 2 million people and 4.5 million hectares of Amazonian forests; and trees on farm in the Sahel increased food crop yields (15-30%) and income (USD 200/year).

In the discussion that followed, the ISPC Chair asked that if the vision is that agriculture and forestry sectors should be joined up in 10 years, was it necessary for CGIAR to continue having Centers that focus on individual sectors (forestry, livestock, commodities etc.). Should it instead consider a different set up (e.g. finance, human rights, etc. Centers)? An ISPC Member noted that the evolution of ideas at CIFOR has had global impacts, but wondered how much progress had been made by CIFOR and CGIAR in breaking down sectoral barriers? Holmgren responded that while breaking down boundaries is difficult, it has to be done and the CIFOR finance work is of mutual development interest and goes above sectoral considerations. An observer noted that the best way to break down boundaries was through students, and encouraged developing deeper and longer-term relationships with universities. Another observer remarked that, financially, CIFOR is associated only with CCAFS and FTA (primarily with FTA) and asked if CIFOR should diversify more. The risk of focusing on one CRP is that one does not achieve integration.

A Council Member asked how CIFOR/FTA considers impact assessments and scientific rigor in IAs given the complexity and diffusion of activities. Nasi admitted that this was indeed a difficult topic, but CIFOR has a team committed on these issues and they were seeking ways of assessing outcomes or impact of policy oriented research in rigorous ways. They also hoped to be more systematic in ex ante and ex post impact assessment but that few donors were willing or able to put money into an assessment exercise carried out 5 or more years after the end of a given project. Nasi also raised the question of what it now meant to have climate change as a cross-cutting theme: does it imply that all CRPs have to work on climate change and that there would be no climate change CRP, or if we would have focused work in one CRP? ISPC Chair responded that CGIAR would have to develop the idea of communities of practice (COPs), and not make cross-cutting themes cumbersome for CRPs – bring about efficiency. Holmgren responded that one would need to have a good view of who was doing what – that the risk of a climate change CRP is that it would focus all attention on it, although he felt that within the CGIAR system no-one can avoid working on climate change.

In breakout sessions CIFOR/FTA scientists presented some of their work in four themes: (a) improved food security and nutrition (Terry Sunderland and Bronwen Powell); (b) improved governance for sustainable natural resources (Maria Ojanen); (c) reduced poverty and

enhanced livelihoods (Christine Padoch and Harry Purwanto); and (d) mitigating and adapting to climate change (Grace Wong and Louis Verchot). Sunderland and Powell presented the research that integrates USAID's DHS (Department of Health Surveys) data with tree cover data in 21 countries of Africa to test the relationship between tree cover and child nutrition indicators. In another study, through the Poverty Environment Network (PEN), approximately 7600 households were interviewed across 24 countries to examine the role of forest foods in diet (diversity and recommended daily allowance). Ojanen presented her work on Evidence-based Forestry Initiative (EBF) that uses systematic reviews to consolidate best available evidence on specific topics – in one case, they looked at how different (forestry) property regimes perform (community *versus* State *versus* private). While Padoch presented results from PEN – the largest global, quantitative comparative project on forests and livelihoods, Purwanto presented CIFOR's action research work with small-medium furniture makers in Indonesia (Java). Finally, Wong presented the work on REDD+, examining its efficiency, equity and effectiveness (of implementation); and Verchot reported on the CIFOR work on emission factors for greenhouse gas inventories in tropical peatlands that has influenced IPCC publications.

Agenda Item 7. Approaches to NRM and environmental services research in CGIAR

Meine van Noordwijk (ICRAF, principal scientist) presented a broad conceptual framework for thinking about how and where environmental services fit into the portfolio of CGIAR research and development activities. van Noordwijk argued that a perspective based on the full range of environmental services that flow from land-use is essential and should be at the heart of what the CGIAR does, rather than having environmental services solely under the System-Level Outcome (SLO) on environmental sustainability. van Noordwijk argued that a theory of place (comprising issues x place x interventions) helps take theories of change from the generic to the contextualized, in the search for “negotiated options in context”.

Ecosystem services perspectives are currently prevalent in WLE, FTA and somewhat in CCAFS programs, but are not notably present in the other CRPs. An example of bringing in an ecosystem services perspective into CCAFS would be to shift the climate change debate beyond carbon emissions to look at the hydrological cycle and the share of evapotranspiration that can be linked to tree cover in different regions of the world. A landscape-scale approach was argued as being critical for making these interconnections between land uses and ecosystem services.

Peter McCornick reinforced the importance of biodiversity losses attributed to processes of agricultural extensification and intensification – that all the data point toward major losses of terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity over time. WLE has an ecosystems services approach as an organizing principle, looking at planetary boundaries on carbon emissions and water use, translated into implications for specific geographic regions. For example, 44% of food is produced using groundwater globally, and 33% of that figure is based on extractions from non-renewable water sources.

Kwesi Atta-Krah reiterated that the systems CRPs take the livelihoods of people in specific geographies as their starting point. *Robert Nasi* argued that the CGIAR is uniquely positioned to take a big-picture perspective on ecosystem services issues across continents, owing to the global network of research Centers. For example, the Congo basin provides rain to the Horn of Africa, and the sedimentation rates in the Amazon can be linked to soil erosion in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Tom Randolph* reminded the audience that the FAO's 2007 report "Livestock's Long Shadow" helped to highlight the ecosystems impacts of livestock-keeping and helped to alert the CGIAR to these issues. However, in the original livestock-fish CRP proposal the focus was on food security and diet diversification, and he noted that the ISPC had insisted on more serious environmental intent. The CRP now pays closer attention to per-unit production emissions and environmental impacts.

Jeff Sayer spoke to the institutional history of the CGIAR, explaining how the establishment of CIFOR, ICRAF, WorldFish and Bioversity was strongly resisted by the CGIAR Technical Advisory Committee (TAC, a pre-cursor to the ISPC) and the CGIAR commodity Centers. The taskforce established during the CGIAR reform period had a noted reluctance to embrace any wider environmental issues, but despite these initial constraints, the CGIAR now has a prominent role in global ecological research. There are other institutions working on husbandry of the natural capital upon which all the CGIAR's work depends (Future Earth, TEEB, etc) but these lack the contact with the country-specific realities that the CGIAR has through its global network. In this context, what kinds of contributions can the CGIAR make that will produce the most significant results?

Maggie Gill noted that CGIAR donors have debated the role of ecosystem services in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework and found it challenging to gain agreement on a strong place for it. Peter Holmgren responded to this comment with concern, and his view that this has translated into a lack of progress in defining SLO3. Commenting on Van Noordwijk's presentation, Holmgren noted the distinction between complicated vs complex solutions. Natural capital accounting simplifies the problem but results in very complicated solutions. There are important differences in the schools of thought on these questions.

Maggie Gill asked specifically whether we know enough about soils. Is there a gap in soil science that the CGIAR should fill? In terms of the correspondence with the Strategy and Results Framework development groups, she also expressed her view that the SRF should send out a strong message that every CRP has to address all three SLOs. Blake Ratner asked how the CGIAR should organize itself in order to integrate the multiple perspectives on ecosystem services and other issues, if closer integration across the system is a measure of the success of the reform. Also, how do we assess competitive choices on water use and land use? John McIntyre challenged this rationale for the reform process, arguing that citation analysis shows that scientists from individual Centers were working (and publishing) together already, before the reform period – the number of co-authored papers was increasing over time. Doug Gollin asked about the comparative advantage of ICRAF and CIFOR's work relative to other providers of work on ecosystem services. Peter Holmgren responded that there is a community of non-governmental organisations and think-tanks that CIFOR is connected with, but that the rigor and scientific excellence of the CGIAR means that these

organisations rely on CIFOR for advice. James Stevenson asked how adopting a landscape-scale approach precludes or otherwise limits the kinds of questions one is interested in and able to address? How large does a landscape have to be in order to capture causal pathways such as those mediated via increasingly global markets? He cited work on specialisation vs integration of ecosystem services where researchers had shown that specialised landscapes (i.e. intensive agriculture and pristine forest) were better for bird populations, for instance, than a mixed matrix of land-uses. Van Noordwijk and Holmgren noted that these are long-debated questions but that one would not come to even ask the question without first taking a landscape-scale perspective.

Agenda Item 8. Impact assessment: Update on the SIAC program

Doug Gollin, Chair of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), sketched the rationale for the four objectives of the SIAC program and presented selected recent activities and outcomes of the SIAC program. As SIAC is now mid-way through its four-year program of work, SPIA recently held a mid-term review of the SIAC program to evaluate progress to-date and solicit input from key stakeholders (SIAC Steering Committee, SPIA members, SIAC Activity Leaders, the Consortium Office, IEA, and donors) about future direction and strategy. The outcomes of the meeting were listed in background material provided to the ISPC, along with a comprehensive narrative describing SIAC progress to-date. Current studies are addressing questions such as whether randomly selected farmers have different results from farmers chosen by CGIAR Center researchers, and how important training is in determining the effective use of a technology. Another critical question – where much still needs to be learned – relates to the reliability of tools and methods currently used to identify specific technologies in the field, and how we can integrate more accurate tools into large scale, high-quality surveys as exemplified by the DNA fingerprinting study to identify specific crop varieties in farmers’ fields.

One member suggested broadening the list of topics of under-evaluated areas of CGIAR investment to include capacity building/training (a similar effort undertaken some 8 years ago was constrained by lack of a systematic effort to track outcomes), as this may well be one of the highest impact areas of CGIAR investment, though it has not been systematically measured to-date. SPIA will add this to the list of under-evaluated areas to be explored.

A question arose in relation to the appropriate weight or emphasis that IA should have in terms of learning and reasonable expectations that it feedback into priority setting and portfolio choice, given the small-scale nature of many of these studies. On the latter point, Gollin explained that although currently the SIAC portfolio looks like a lot of short stories, SPIA believes it can add value through providing a synthesis and by “embracing the complexity”. In the RCT experiments, it will take a couple more years to start getting more coherent stories, so the information is partial at this point.

An ISPC member commented that there should be a greater emphasis (and budget) within the CRPs devoted to *ex post* IA. Should a community of practice dimension be built formally into each CRP? Gollin responded by reminding the group that the bulk of *ex post* IA has been and will continue to be done by the Centers. SPIA's goal is to test and provide improved methods of assessing impacts, help compile the relevant databases, forge collaborations with the broader evaluation and impact community, and do IAs that go beyond the scope of any one Center or CRP. The Quality Review system about to be launched is an example of the kind of global public goods that SPIA is providing to the Centers and the System.

In response to a question about how SPIA goes about determining attribution of impact between CGIAR Centers and other partners, Gollin responded that there is no single answer and each study deals with it differently. Also, it is not always essential that we disentangle CGIAR's vs others' contributions, sometimes it is enough just to document collective impact *per se* without attribution.

An observer raised a question about the relevance of some of the studies commissioned by SPIA which seem to be re-documenting earlier studies (rice in Bangladesh, wheat in Mexico), so it not clear what is actually new or of great value here. He also questioned the interpretation of some of the results about 'learning' from the RCT work, in particular, that purposive selection of farmers (as done by IITA) may not always be inappropriate, it would depend on the objectives and farmer group targeted. Finally, he asked about the value of undertaking IA of NRM research given the NRM stripe review covered this ground, and showed that there was little evidence of impact to-date. Gollin responded that many of these studies are undertaken not so much to give us new estimates of impact but to give us new insight and tell us something more about technology adoption and impact, i.e., to address deeper questions. In terms of the results (learning) from a RCT, Gollin emphasized that the CGIAR Center was actually working with farmers who are not typical, i.e., were above average in many respects, and yes, there may be cases where that's a deliberate strategy to follow but we need to be aware of it, and it would clearly may not be appropriate if we are testing for broader application. As for the point about NRM research impacts, many might not agree that this is an area that has (or has had) little potential to generate impact, the zero tillage effort in northern India is such an example.

The ISPC Chair thanked Gollin for his presentation and noted with satisfaction the positive developments under the SIAC program.

Agenda Item 9. Mobilizing science

(i) *Partnership study, presentation by Jeroen Dijkman (ISPC Secretariat):* Jeroen Dijkman, ISPC Secretariat, outlined the approach for the study of research for development partnerships emerging for the CRP portfolio. He indicated that any kind of study focussing on this topic would look at successful science partnerships; however, the ISPC was more interested in looking at issues that might require further in-depth assessment

to ensure that - in the words of the Mid-Term Review Panel's report (MTR)-, the "*formation and incentivisation of the appropriate partnerships*", becomes a key tool in helping the CGIAR meet its goals and responsibilities in the international AR4D space. There is clear agreement on the key guiding principles of an AR4D approach: a) aimed at the delivery of development impact at different scales and timeframes; b) adapted to systemic nature of the innovation and development process; and c) no primacy allocated to any particular mode of research or development practice. The (MTR) identified the need for "*Strategic partnerships that will lead to the delivery of the agricultural research required to transform agriculture to meet nutritional requirements and a food secure future*", as one of the five big challenges facing the CGIAR in its "transformation".

There is explicit recognition of the need for partnership beyond the "traditional" (different kinds of partners are needed to deliver on the new agenda) and this accompanies the CGIAR's adoption of innovation systems as a conceptual framework. There is an impressive array of new partners and partnerships and an overriding reason for "new" partnerships is the engagement of development partners to take technologies that are ready (or near ready) to go to scale. A number of CRPs have opted for "innovation platforms". Benefits in innovative performance may result from productive relationships between those organizations engaged in formal research and those engaged in the use of new knowledge in economic production. Such learning-based approaches can work well within the sphere of community action and may have significant impact on local (research) capacities.

He noted that an assumption in most CGIAR partnerships is that research products are the starting point and that innovation is a research and technology driven process. Therefore, key partnership tasks involve making information and technology available for use, and supporting existing and new delivery mechanisms. Measures of success include rates of adoption by farmers and impact at household level, with maybe some insights about the effectiveness of different type of delivery systems. On the other hand, partnership-based activities where research and its products are just one source of information, and where key tasks involve linking and enabling technical, institutional, and policy change, are rare. If all interventions are experimental and partners jointly experiment with new configurations and ways of working that would enable innovation, then measures of success would be very different, i.e. provide insights on how best to organize for learning and innovation in different contexts.

In the absence of within and among CRP linkages and coordination that would permit across site analyses and learning, what is the value-added of CGIAR involvement in largely development activities only? There does not seem to be any clear evidence of connection among breakthroughs in frontier science (both within and without the CGIAR) and breakthroughs in understanding how knowledge is produced, packaged, and applied to solving problems or in response to opportunities at the food and agriculture interface. Exclusive partnership contracts between CRPs and NGOs/CSOs/private sector organizations in the execution of local activities may restrict dissemination and partnership options, and also pre-empt experimentation on how to finance and stimulate innovation by combining

different forms of entrepreneurship. With regards to CGIAR's donor partnerships, different funding windows are increasingly allowing donors to set research agendas, and, by extension, to co-opt fungible core funds. These partnerships perpetuate an institutional environment where donors' vision of scaling out research products to farmers almost exclusively shapes notions of accountability and impact; and which restricts the scope to contemplate different ideas beyond the technology-led vision of innovation. Such funding imperatives resonate also in the general assumption that higher level institutional and policy learning / change will take care of itself. The CGIAR also does not pursue partnerships that would see it represented or lead in relevant regional and global discussions. A strategy to ensure alignment or leveraging of other research and development spending towards the CGIAR's stated objectives is missing. To date, the partnership arrangements pursued and developed do not recognize the cross-sectoral linkages, interactions, and trade-offs that will be required as an integral part of delivering on the promise of AR4D.

He concluded his presentation with some bottom lines. CGIAR has firmly pegged its future engagement in the global food and agriculture arena to AR4D. However, it still appears to be an organization that offers supply-side science, rather than a program of global AR4D excellence to tackle the major development challenges laid out in its SLOs. CGIAR should explicitly include roles as facilitators and practitioners of global R4D excellence in its mandate as Centres of research excellence. It will have to effectively link breakthroughs in understanding and practice of poverty reduction at the food and agriculture interface, with breakthroughs in understanding how knowledge is produced, packaged, and targeted at solving problems or in responding to opportunities. Understanding the ways in which the process of research and partnership is used for innovation and sustainable development, rather than only how research products are transferred and adopted, is essential. There are many different roles for research in the innovation and development process; currently, however, this is often being interpreted to justify a large diversity of approaches in partnership for local development problem solving. In the absence of an overall research strategy and appropriate coordination, there is inherent danger of inefficient resource use, not providing additional insight on how best to organize for innovation and development in different contexts.

Attention to the wider institutional change agenda and the partnership required for this is essential to achieve the potential of the CGIAR for impact. A stronger basis needs to be provided to engage in ongoing sectoral and cross-sectoral global dialogues, and also to establish and lead new relevant agenda-setting dialogues to provide its mandated leadership in harnessing agricultural research for innovation and development. An avenue for opening up debate would be to contemplate different ideas beyond the technology-led vision of innovation.

The ensuing discussion was chaired by Marcio de Miranda Santos, ISPC Council member. He talked about the difficulties faced by the ISPC in terms of looking at science and partnerships of the CGIAR's research agenda. Often insufficient information is provided, particularly about the alignment of Theories of Change and Impact pathways in the CRPs;

instead a comprehensive list of partners is offered. Looking at translation costs, IPR issues, complementarities, use of infrastructure, etc. would be useful.

Additional issues raised included the uneven performance of the CGIAR (some Centers and CRPs being central for global policy-making) together with challenges of governance, transparency, accountability and the way resources are shared. In terms of framing agendas and portfolios, the influence of donors and CGIAR leaders is seen, but not the end-users. A clearer, harmonized typology of different kinds of partnerships in R4D and their functions would be extremely welcome. Another critical issue brought up was that of attribution. It would be dangerous for the CGIAR to alienate its partners by claiming credit. At the same time, an important role of the ISPC is to provide Funders with an appreciation of the level of influence beyond technology and how that would affect interpretation of target beneficiaries. Tools are needed to demonstrate clear attribution to changes. Finally, with regards to funding, participants discussed the amount of W1/W2 funding that currently goes to non-CGIAR partners. In some cases the CGIAR is funding organizations that are not capable of certain capacities, which raises ethical issues for management. Nevertheless, some CRPs are in the process of developing joint agendas with partners and raising resources together, not sub-contracting partners. The ISPC study of partnerships will be developed through a paper which expands on the above, followed by a workshop in 2015 to consider partnership strategies including incentives and communication.

(ii) Overview of outputs from Science Forum 13

Preet Lidder, ISPC Secretariat, introduced the topic by stating that the Science Forum (SF) series is a flagship event initiated by the ISPC in 2009 under its remit of mobilizing science for development as a means of reaching out to scientists and scientific communities, largely external to the CGIAR, but who have potentially important contributions to make to the CGIAR research portfolio. The 2013 edition of the SF focussed on “*Nutrition and Health Outcomes: Targets for Agricultural Research*” and was held in Bonn, Germany from 23-25 September. It was co-hosted by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Germany. John McDermott from the CRP-A4NH had worked in close cooperation with the Steering Committee to develop the program.

She then provided a short update of the follow-up activities that had taken place. A summary of the plenaries and 10 breakout sessions together with a brief distilling the key messages had been published subsequent to the Forum. In addition, key findings of SF13 were relayed verbally to the Technical Meeting of the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) in November 2013. An innovation in the 2013 SF was the introduction of a session targeted at early-career scientists (ECS). Funds were made available for a competition between the 21 ECS who attended the SF, to support exchange visits and create new partnerships. The ISPC supported seven exchange visits in 2014, including 1 with Helen Keller International and ICRAF; 2 with the World Vegetable Center; 1 with Tufts University; 1 with ILRI; and 2 with Bioversity International.

The ISPC also conducted an evaluation of the SF in terms of its utility as a core mechanism for mobilizing science. It was organized as a self-evaluation but with external assistance on evaluation and quality assurance. The evaluation report was published in April 2014 and reflects that the SFs have evolved since their inception in line with experience and the lessons learned. The 2013 SF was considered very positively by attendees, particularly the focus on science issues and a good array of events at relatively modest outlay. The evaluation reports on the intangible benefits of networking and of providing opportunities to young and developing country scientists. It highlights the importance of publishing papers from the Fora in a special edition of a peer-reviewed journal, both to raise awareness of development issues among parts of the international scientific community, which are not working on agriculture for development, and also to draw attention to the high-quality research that the CGIAR is conducting. Issues identified include ensuring that new cross-cutting information is distilled for policy makers; need to engage fully with the Centers and CRPs so they see value in participating; and structuring more time for dialogue, discussion and debate by decongesting the program.

Discussion at SF13 led to agreement that agricultural research could have more impact on nutrition and health outcomes by prioritizing research questions about access to nutritious food, diet quality, food safety and generally that impact should be measured by appropriate and more proximal indicators than stunting. These two broad topics were explored in more detail at a joint Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)/ISPC follow-up workshop held at IFPRI exactly one year after the Science Forum in September 2014. The two-day workshop attracted over 40 participants and had two objectives: to inform the second round of CRP proposals in terms of delivering improved nutrition outcomes from agricultural research; and to feed into the special issue publication where appropriate. Key findings from the workshop were published in a brief in January 2015 and included greater understanding of the context in which the expected research results would be implemented; additional approaches to enhancing diet diversity; the need for a focus on appropriate indicators and on how to evaluate progress; and partner choice and organization.

Ten original refereed papers (5 authored by CGIAR scientists) together with an introductory paper arising from the September workshop would be published in April/May in a special section of the journal Food Security under an open access arrangement. The papers can be grouped into 3 categories - the first three papers lay out the context of the enabling socio-political environment, and desired outcomes of the food system: improving multiple aspects of nutrition simultaneously, and sustainably within environmental boundaries. The second set of papers deals with increasing access to nutritious, safe food through markets, as well as non-market channels. The last two papers synthesize what this current research means for agricultural research and policy. Overall the papers illustrate how global food systems are changing and suggest how agricultural research needs to change if it is to make a major contribution to nutrition and health outcomes.

Agenda Item 10. Identifying requirements in the development of a portfolio of programs for the CGIAR

Rachid Serraj presented a summary of “ideas notes” submitted by CRPs and CGIAR Centers late in 2014 as part of the revision process for the SRF. A total of 149 ideas notes were submitted across the priority research areas of: genetic gain through breeding; sustainable NRM and resilience; improving and scaling-out seed systems; characterisation and use of genetic diversity (crop, livestock and fish breeding programs); sustainable intensification and management of agricultural and aquatic systems; gender, diversity and social equity; adoption and diffusion of technologies; enabling policy environment and agricultural performance. Several clusters of ideas notes emerged under each of the following research areas: nutrition, dietary diversification and health; value chains and innovation; climate-smart agriculture; food safety and health; institutional innovation and reform; and animal health.

In response Tom Tomich noted the IFPRI contribution on energy, transport and food security, and asked where something like that fit would fit into the existing CGIAR portfolio? Doug Gollin reviewed the technology adoption and policy / enabling environment ideas notes and found them well-written and interesting, particularly a note on agricultural mechanization. Gollin suggested that enough has changed since mechanization was phased out from the CGIAR portfolio in the 1980s and 90s that this could be worthy of being developed further. Marcio Miranda-Santos, in reviewing the genetic diversity ideas notes, found little that could be described as novel, but that a theme emerged that we can now have better control over what is being conserved. Takuji Sasaki noted that the separation of a genebank CRP from the commodity CRPs is concerning, and that the role for modern technology in breeding is clear and gives scope for new partnerships. Jeff Sayer, in reviewing the NRM-focused ideas notes, found many focused on how you measure specific indicators and causal relationships, as well as spatial organization of science, and the use and limits of modelling. On the topic of animal health, Peter Gardiner noted that there might be potentially major efforts in livestock health, genetics and feed research but currently outside the L&F CRP. He noted that a recent conference had highlighted the existence of antibiotic resistant plasmids in aquaculture fish in Asia, which represents a major human health risk. It is unclear what a research effort focused on the issue might look like for the CGIAR and where terrestrial livestock and fish sciences can properly be brought together in the CGIAR portfolio, in the focus on value chains. Maggie Gill noted that many ideas notes mention “food systems” but cautioned that there are many interpretations of what it means, and that a potential lack of clarity should be borne in mind. Jeroen Dijkman noted the ideas on the intersection between energy, agriculture and labour markets were interesting and should be incorporated somewhere in the portfolio. Rachid Serraj questioned whether the issues identified in the ISPC biotechnology study have been taken on-board by the CGIAR system. Maggie Gill responded noting that this should be a criterion during the review of the CRP proposals – whether the findings from the ISPC strategic studies were adequately reflected.

Peter Holmgren noted that the exercise of soliciting ideas notes from CRPs suffered somewhat from a design problem – that new ideas were asked for at a time when the new

strategy and results framework is locked in. Within the priority topics identified, climate-smart agriculture is one that much of the CGIAR has their sights set on. However, it should be remembered that the FAO conceptualisation has always talked about agriculture in the widest sense (agriculture, fisheries, forestry) and emphasizes that climate-smart agriculture has three dimensions – productivity; resilience / adaptation; mitigation – in that order of priority. This original conceptualisation has been somewhat hijacked but it is an important part of the mix of the new CRPs.

Wayne Powell reported that he read the ideas notes looking for what might be described as “technology breakthrough areas” and noted that there are some examples in the set that are really welcome. Taking full advantage of the new technologies will require engagement with the private sector in a different way. Sami Gaiji asked whether post-harvest issues were addressed in the ideas notes, as their inclusion in the SRF was a point of debate among the donors. Shoba Shivashanka responded that the Dryland cereals CRP, in its extension phase, recognised that they don’t have the strength they need in post-harvest and they need to find the right partners to work effectively on that issue. Further, she noted that CGIAR have such a goldmine with its genebank diversity but that we have not used methods that we could use for accelerated genetic gain – to go from OPV to hybrid in a few years. Maggie Gill noted that germplasm screening for nutrient / micro-nutrient content is an exciting research area.

In discussing the overall portfolio of CRPs for the second call, Tom Tomich acknowledged the need to be pragmatic and noted that the ISPC appreciates the initiative of the DGs in finding a simple solution for consolidating CRPs. However, he remained concerned that there is a gap at the system level in the processes for creating a real portfolio of CRPs. Maggie Gill, continuing on this theme, explained her perspective on the need for balance between opportunities for doing new things versus a strong desire for continuity. A lot has been achieved in the reform process but it is widely felt that there has been too much “churn”. How can we get on the front foot and be a bit more proactive? At the end of the meeting, ISPC will write a 2-page summary for input to the Fund Council meeting on the portfolio and there are great expectations for that meeting at end of April.

The Chair moved to the principles for the design of a portfolio. In particular, the template for pre-proposals and proposals was discussed. The Consortium Board had proposed pre-proposals be limited to 10 pages. The ISPC felt uncomfortable in basing a review for a large program on such a short document. An alternative is for a 10 page limit at CRP level, followed by 8 pages maximum per flagship. Jeff Sayer was ambivalent regarding format and felt that the focus at the pre-proposal stage should be on the big issues and big ideas. Wayne Powell argued that the time pressure for getting pre-proposals prepared implied the need for short pre-proposals. There should be enough flexibility in the system to identify high-level strategic need at pre-proposal stage, and that this will be an iterative process – not just paper exercise.

Suggestions arising from discussion were that: rather than requesting information on research activities that are being stopped, the template should have an item about what has been learned that validates the approach that is proposed, and how the impact pathway may have

changed with time. What is the evidence that gives confidence that this is an appropriate approach? A key criterion for a flagship is “researchability” – is this the kind of problem that can be addressed by research and feed through to impact? Doug Gollin agreed with the usefulness of emphasising what has been learned, but felt it was important to nonetheless highlight what is no longer being pursued in the CRP.

Peter Holmgren noted that it is important to discuss the degrees of freedom at flagship level. A flagship could focus on policy / civil society engagement as a whole for the CRP, alongside 7 or 8 that are thematically focused on research topics. Oscar Ortiz noted that the RTB CRP have discovery, delivery, and learning flagship categories.

Marcio di Miranda Santos outlined a proposal for a scoring scheme on CRP proposals. There is currently a lot of uncertainty, but if we assume we are working from a scenario of an “average level” of aggregation among CRPs and not starting from scratch, it raises the following questions. What evidence is there that we are capturing synergies among partners and flagships within CRPs? What evidence is there that lessons learned have been captured and integrated in the structure and function of the CRP? How well-aligned is the proposal with the sub-IDOs – is the proposal taking the SRF seriously and the links within it? How credible is the scientific argument and the strategy that is linked to the theory of change?

The Chair suggested that these ideas would be developed further by the ISPC. In the portfolio, she wondered who is going to be responsible for coordinating the IDOs and Sub-IDOs for the cross-cutting themes. The concept of a community of practice would make this easier and would flow organically from efforts already underway. One option is to include in the call the opportunity for CRPs / Centers to bid to take on this coordination. This is something that could be discussed in more detail in the ISPC meeting in September 2015 and Fund Council meeting in November 2015.

Agenda Item 11. Setting the scene for the next Science Forum

(i) Research towards the alleviation of poverty:

Professor Anil K. Gupta from the National Innovation Foundation in India and member of the ISPC-organized Steering Committee for the next Science Forum, spoke to the group on “*Empathetic innovations for inclusive agricultural research*”. In his talk he drew from his experience with the Honey bee network, an informal global social movement. This network emphasizes learning from grassroots innovations, being inclusive and seeking solutions to problems from many different spaces and actors. Farmers have a taxonomy of almost everything – this is local knowledge that can be extremely useful. Taxonomy, he emphasized, is at the core of targeting. So, we need to bring the skills and knowledge of the people to bear in enterprise, and be thinking about using new instruments. Everyone has a skill. There is no such thing as an “unskilled” person.

Gupta provided a rich array of examples of how local innovators in India have solved real-life problems drawing on their own knowledge and expertise, e.g., use of corn cobs to absorb residual oil in industrial machines, bicycle refrigerators for rural areas, modified walkers for climbing stairs, and so on. There are now more than 12,000 examples of successful innovations identified since the Honey bee network started in 1987. There are traditional technologies available for almost everything that is needed, e.g., harvesting fish by using of plants that anaesthetize the fish. A key point is that we can learn from people who have observed things, and we can apply this learning across sectors. Children, in particular, are under-appreciated in this respect. He highlighted numerous examples of how children, when given the opportunity and incentive, can be effective problem solvers, and sources of novel ideas and creative solutions. Culture, education and institutions work together in the development and use of appropriate innovations, and we need Research and Development to underpin and support this process.

Gupta spoke about the need to think in terms of maximizing managerial intensity rather than material intensity, and how this should be the focus of our research. As Vernon Ruttan had emphasized long ago we need to have our focus on what the poor require, and what can be adapted for their use. Breeders, for example, need to think about what types of varieties perform best under the specific conditions that the poor typically manage for a particular crop. And impact assessment should go beyond grain yield effects only to consider other outputs, e.g., fodder quantity and quality, and what labour demands are required at the different stages of production and harvest.

ISPC members welcomed the presentation as a refreshing way of considering how we approach prioritisation and the innovation process. It is clearly not a dichotomy of indigenous innovation versus science - it is not either/ or. Research can and should support and underpin novel approaches to innovation that make use of local talent and ingenuity, and allow users to play a key role in the innovation process. The meeting agreed that, depending on the situation, there are other paths to poverty alleviation beyond the productivity-led one, and the ISPC needs to give more thought to different theories of change here.

In response to a question about how to keep innovations for the public good when good ideas are captured by elites, Gupta agreed this can be a problem but often internal rules and norms exist, along with different types of capital (jealousy, social, etc.) that work to prevent this type of capture, though he emphasized that we need to pay more attention to institutions in our work. The discussion was wide-ranging but supported the quoted Ruttan view that technologies are rarely neutral and changes in technology do produce differential impacts that have distributional consequences, so we need to try to anticipate these *ex-ante* and check for these *ex post*.

The CGIAR is interested in the fact that poor people can and do innovate, but the question remains what is the best way for scientists to help them. For example, is the best way to help poor fishing communities in SE Asia to set up hubs where people can innovate themselves, as per the AAS CRP approach? This is a fundamentally important point, because CGIAR

research is expensive – and we are not certain if this novel process and infrastructure will lead to innovations that address poverty on a large scale. Can we, with our expensive infrastructure enable innovation for millions of people? Gupta agreed that in some cases this could be wasteful (e.g., monitoring farmers' plots for 30 years) so we need to be careful. Still, the poor people need the participation of scientists to help them discover and innovate, much more so than large farmers need them. It is important for example to conserve local varieties for them, and many activities such as these, e.g., in-situ conservation, do not require heavy infrastructure investment, but we do need to compensate farmers who grow such indigenous varieties.

In responding to a question about the importance of participatory breeding, targeting gender-friendly traits in different niche locations, and how this might limit the potential for achieving large scale adoption rates, Gupta replied that scale should not be the enemy of sustainability. Many poor are located in niches and niches are important. If scale is all we are concerned with we will miss those niches, so we need new ways of managing diversity, e.g., by developing markets for diversity, and we need to work with supply chain managers to encourage niche production and markets. More heterogeneity is the key; we need to conserve local biodiversity and take advantage of it in terms of consumer preference evolution, e.g., from processed foods to traditional (healthier) food choices.

Whether the capacity to innovate is in itself a justifiable goal for CGIAR research was raised, and whether there are examples of outside agencies that have fostered the ability to innovate. Gupta responded to this by citing the many examples of where children from both villages and urban slums have, given the right incentives, exhibited creativity in unexpected ways. Gupta feels we need to do much more with children and proposed having a special session at the SF16 devoted to this. He also proposed a session at the SF16 focused on the investment enterprises in partnership with the poor (or even non-poor) but use their ideas! Solutions that come from individuals often never make it to the education system, so we need to inculcate this sense of the importance of diversity into the education system.

Tom Tomich closed the session by warmly thanking Professor Gupta for his presentation and the discussion. This session highlighted, among other things, the need to think more carefully about the pathways to poverty alleviation, how innovations can and do come from many sources – and need to be supported and encouraged - and that agricultural productivity growth may be one (among others) of the important links to poverty alleviation, but we need to be aware of the biases.

(iii) Report on the preparations for SF16 (Maggie Gill): Maggie Gill gave a brief overview of what had been done to date in preparation for the SF16. The Forum would focus on SLO1 - the contribution of agriculture to reducing poverty. Advice had been solicited from CGIAR colleagues to finalize the theme for the 2016 SF and to sharpen the focus of the Forum. The venue would be Addis Ababa and the Forum would be held in late March/early April 2016. The ISPC had received a positive response from UNECA regarding their interest in being involved. The target number of participants, as for the previous Fora, is 250-300.

She elaborated that the objective of SF16 is “*to explore recent experience and evidence on the successes and failures of agricultural research designed to reduce poverty, with an emphasis on the impact of current and future climate change on the design of research questions.*” Potential themes for the program included Theories of change: from agricultural research to poverty alleviation; geography and structural aspects of poverty: a global “top-down” view; livelihood / asset based perspectives on poverty: regional “bottom-up” context; smallholder strategies in development context; resilience strategies in development context; food security and human nutrition, in the context of climate change; and, implications for strategic priorities and CGIAR program design.

The Forum will aim for a 50:50 ratio between presentation and discussion, and presentations and interventions of different lengths. The ISPC will also seek diversity in participation and presentations, including representatives from donor agencies, NGOs, and the private sector as well as researchers both from within and external to the CGIAR. The goal will be to have 50% female presenters, and a significant proportion of presentations from Southern partners. The Steering Committee for SF16 includes Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair), Tom Tomich (University of California Davis), Gebisa Ejeta (Purdue University), Rashid Hassan (University of Pretoria), Anil Gupta (Honey Bee Network India), Bruce Campbell (Director CCAFS), Rajul Pandya-Lorch (IFPRI) and Preet Lidder (ISPC Secretariat). The first meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) meeting was held virtually on 26 March 2015 and the concept note is being revised in light of discussions and inputs from SC members. A second SC meeting is envisaged in April, as is a site visit. Next steps involve developing the draft program, identifying key speakers, launching the SF16 website, and striving to enhance ECS professional development through better integration into the program.

Agenda Item 12. AOB

The Chair noted that an advertisement for new Council members had been placed and the Secretariat had assisted in managing the first stages of the application process which would result in the appointment of four new Council members between July 2015 and the first ISPC meeting of 2016. Three of the four posts would rotate existing membership, whilst the fourth position would lead to an anticipated growth of the Council number in anticipation of the final ISPC Task Force report.

She also noted that Peter Gardiner, the Executive Director, would be stepping down at the mandatory retirement age for FAO staff. She thanked him for his professional services to the ISPC and to the Science Council before that. Gardiner thanked the current Council, and for their gift. He said that he had greatly enjoyed working with them and many of the previous luminaries amongst former Council members. He thanked Secretariat colleagues for all their help and support over the years.

There being no other business, the meeting was closed at lunchtime.

DRAFT Agenda

11th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council 30 March - 1 April 2015

CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor, Indonesia
Jalan Cifor, Situ Gede, Sindang Barang, Bogor Barat, Jawa Barat

Sunday 29th March

Arrival of ISPC, Council and participants

Afternoon: ISPC closed session (held at the hotel – Salak room)

ISPC closed dinner (at the hotel restaurant Verandah)

Monday 30th March

Plenary for the meeting: Amazon meeting room - CIFOR

09:00

Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

- i. Welcome and opening by Prof. Maggie Gill,
ISPC Chair
- ii. Welcome by Dr. Peter Holmgren
CIFOR Director-General

09:30

Item 2. CGIAR update: Reports of the system units

- i. ISPC Chair, *Maggie Gill*
- ii. Consortium, Chief Scientific Officer, *Wayne Powell*
- iii. Fund Office, Executive Secretary, *Samy Gaiji*
- iv. IEA (Information will be provided on the evaluation
schedule)
- v. Discussion

11:00

Coffee break

Tuesday 31st March

For items 6 and 7, at Global Forestry Hall - CIFOR

09:00

Item 6. CIFOR presentation

(The CIFOR Director General, *Peter Holmgren*, colleagues and partners will present CIFOR, its approach and activities, with detail about progress of the Forest, Trees and Agroforestry CRP).

- i. Status of tropical forests
- ii. CIFOR and how it fits into the global system
- iii. The FTA program; achievements, lessons learned and the future (*Robert Nasi*: CRP leader FTA)
- iv. Four-corners interactive session (CIFOR and climate change; poverty; food security and nutrition; environment)
- v. Discussion

Coffee to be taken during the rotation of participants (iv)

11:15

Item 7. Approaches to NRM and environmental services research in the CGIAR

- i. Introduction to the topic: *Meine van Noordwijk* (World Agroforestry Center)
- ii. Responses from other CRPs
- iii. Discussion (Chair: *Jeff Sayer*, ISPC)

12:30

Lunch

14:00

Item 8. Impact assessment: Update on the SIAC program

- i. Presentation of recent findings and activities of the SIAC program: *Doug Gollin* (SPIA Chair)
- ii. Discussion

15:00

Item 9. Mobilizing science

- i. Partnership study. Presentation by *Jeroen Dijkman* (ISPC Secretariat); session Chair: *Marcio de Miranda Santos* (ISPC)
- ii. Overview of outputs from Science Forum 13 (*Preet Lidder*, ISPC Secretariat)

15:45

Coffee break

- 16:15 **Item 10. Identifying requirements in the development of a portfolio of programs for the CGIAR** (*Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair*)
- Structural considerations responding to the SRF (Summary of debate so far: *Peter Gardiner, ISPC Ex. Director*)
 - New science: a summary of “ideas notes” (*Rachid Serraj, ISPC Secretariat/Council speaker tbc*)
 - Discussion with CRPs
- 18:00 End of day 2
- 19:30 Meeting reception and dinner hosted by the ISPC, for all participants. To be held Novotel Bogor restaurant Verandah.

Wednesday 1st April

- 09:00 **Item 11. Setting the scene for the next Science Forum**
- i. Research towards the alleviation of poverty: *Professor Anil K. Gupta, National Innovation Foundation, India*
 - ii. Discussion (*Tom Tomich, ISPC*)
 - iii. Report on the preparations for SF16 (*Maggie Gill*)
- 10:30 *Coffee break*
- 11:00 **Item 12. AOB**
- 12:30 End of meeting
- 14:00-17:00 **ISPC closed session** (at CIFOR, Amazon room)
- Council free to depart*

List of participants
11th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council
30 March - 1 April 2015
CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor, Indonesia

ISPC COUNCIL

Margaret Evelyn Gill

Chair, ISPC
Professor of Integrated Land Use
University of Aberdeen
14B/10 Riversdale Crescent
Edinburgh, EH12 5QT
United Kingdom
Tel. +44 770 31 31 373
Email: m.gill@abdn.ac.uk

Segenet Kelemu

Director General, International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)
African Insect Science for Food and Health
P.O. Box 30772-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 (20) 8632000
Fax: +254 (20) 8632001/8632002
E-mail: skelemu@icipe.org

Douglas Gollin

Chair, SPIA
Department of International Development, University of Oxford
Queen Elizabeth House
3 Mansfield Road
Oxford OX1 3TB
United Kingdom
Tel. +44 (0)1865 281 832
Email: douglas.gollin@qeh.ox.ac.uk

Jeffrey Sayer

Director, Development Practice Programme
School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
James Cook University
PO Box 6811, Cairns
N. Queensland 4870
Australia
Tel. +61 74-042-1663
Email: jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au

Marcio de Miranda Santos

Executive Director, Center for Strategic Studies and
Management of Science, Technology and Innovation
Tel. +55 61-342-49-601/11
Fax. +55 61-342-49-660
Email: mmiranda@cgee.org.br

Thomas P. Tomich

W.K. Kellogg Endowed Chair in Sustainable Food Systems
Founding Director, UC Davis Agricultural Sustainability Institute (ASI)
Director, UC Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SAREP)
Host, Inter-Institutional Network for Food, Agriculture and Sustainability (INFAS)
Professor of Community Development, Environmental Science & Policy
University of California, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-8523 USA
Tel: +1 (530) 752-3915
Email: tptomich@ucdavis.edu

Takuji Sasaki

Professor NODAI Research Institute
Tokyo University of Agriculture
1-1, Sakuragaoka 1-chome, Setagaya-ku
Tokyo 156-8502, JAPAN
Phone/fax: +81-(0)3-5477-2376
E-mail: t5sasaki@nodai.ac.jp

SPEAKERS

Wayne Powell

Chief Science Officer
CGIAR Consortium Office
c/o Agropolis International
Avenue Agropolis
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5
Tel. +33 4 670 47 575
Email: w.powell@cgiar.org

Peter Holmgren

Director General
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Jalan CIFOR
Situ Gede, Sindang Barang
Bogor (Barat) 16115
Indonesia
Tel: 62-251-8622-622
Email: p.holmgren@cgiar.org

Kwesi Atta Krah

Director
CGIAR Research Program on Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
PMB 5320, Oyo Road, Ibadan, Nigeria
Tel: +1 201 633 6094 or +234 2 7517472 ext 4900
Email: k.atta-krah@cgiar.org

Anil K. Gupta

Professor
Indian Institute of Management
Vastrapur, Ahmedabad
Gujarat, India
Tel: +91 79 66324947
Email: anilg@iimahd.ernet.in

Meine Van Noordwijk

Chief Science Advisor / Leader Global Research Project – Environmental Services
World Agroforestry Centre
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
PO Box 30677, Nairobi, 00100, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7224000
Email: M.vanNoordwijk@cgiar.org

John McIntire

Associate Vice-President of Programmes
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Via Paolo di Dono, 44
00142 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 0654591
Email: j.mcintire@ifad.org

Bustanul Arifin

Professor
University of Lampung
Jalan Professor Doktor Sumantri Brojonegoro No. 1,
Bandar Lampung, Lampung 35145,
Indonesia
Tel: +62 721 701609
Email: barifin@uwalumni.com

Samy Francois Gaiji

Senior Operations Officer - Science
CGIAR Fund Office
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
USA
Tel: +1-202-473-8912
Email: sgaiji@worldbank.org

Werner L. Kornexl

World Bank Indonesia
Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) Tower 2
Jendral Sudirman, Senayan , Kebayoran Baru , 12190 Jakarta Selatan , DKI Jakarta,
Indonesia
Tel: +62 21 52993000
Email: wkornexl@worldbank.org

Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin

Director
IEA
c/o FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome Italy
Tel. +39 570 53721
Email: Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org

OBSERVERS

Ahmed Kablan

International Nutrition and Public Health Research Adviser
USAID/Bureau for Food Security
Office of Agriculture, Research and Policy
Research Division
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel. 202 712 5303
Email: akablan@usaid.gov

Robert Nasi

CRP Director
CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry
Jalan CIFOR
Situ Gede, Sindang Barang
Bogor (Barat) 16115
Indonesia
Tel: 62 251 8622 622
Email: r.nasi@cgiar.org

Sobhana (Shoba) Sivasankar

Director
CGIAR Research Program on Drylands Cereals
ICRISAT
Patancheru 502 324
Andhra Pradesh, India
Tel. +91 4030713086 Cell. +91 9573225463 Fax. +91 4030713074
Email: s.sivasankar@cgiar.org

Peter McCornick

Deputy Director General
International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
127, Sunil Mawatha, Pelawatte, Battaramulla
Sri Lanka
Tel: +94 11 2880000
Email: P.McCornick@cgiar.org

Óscar Ortiz

Deputy Director General for Research and Development
Centro Internacional de la Papa (CIP)
Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina
Apartado Postal 1558, Lima
Peru
Tel: +511 3496017
Email: CIP-DDG-Research@cgiar.org

John Colmey

Director, Communications and External Relations
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Jalan CIFOR
Situ Gede, Sindang Barang
Bogor (Barat) 16115
Indonesia
Tel: 62 251 8622 622
Email: J.Colmey@cgiar.org

Marlene Diekmann

Title:Beratungsgruppe entwicklungsorientierte Agrarforschung (BEAF)
Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 40
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 44 60-0
Tel: +49 228 24934 212
Email: marlene.diekmann@giz.de

Blake Ratner

Director, Research
World Fish
Jalan Batu Maung, Batu Maung,
11960 Bayan Lepas,
Penang, Malaysia
Tel: +60 4 626 1606
Email: B.Ratner@cgiar.org

ISPC Secretariat**Peter Gardiner**

Executive Director
c/o FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome Italy
Tel. +39 570 52458
Email: peter.gardiner@fao.org

Timothy Kelley

Senior Agricultural Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 54210
Email: timothy.kelley@fao.org

Rachid Serraj

Senior Agricultural Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 55659
Email: rachid.serraj@fao.org

Jeroen Dijkman

Senior Agricultural Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 59797
Email: Jeroen.Dijkman@fao.org

James Stevenson

Agricultural Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 52251
Email: james.stevenson@fao.org

Preetmoninder Lidder

Agricultural Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 56208
Email: preetmoninder.lidder@fao.org

Lakshmi Krishnan

Agricultural Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 53422
Email: lakshmi.krishnan@fao.org

Ira Vater

Project Coordinator, SPIA
c/o FAO
Tel: +39 570 53757
Email: ira.vater@fao.org

Mae C. Maghirang

Consultant
c/o FAO
Tel: +39 570 5100
Email: mae.maghirang@fao.org

Muriel Pougheon

Program Assistant/ Administrative Coordinator
c/o FAO
Tel. + 39 06 570 52103
Email: muriel.pougheon@fao.org

CIFOR COORDINATOR UNIT STAFF

Gugi Ginanjar

Events Assistant

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Jalan CIFOR

Situ Gede, Sindang Barang

Bogor (Barat) 16115

Indonesia

Tel: 62 251 8622 622

Email: g.ginanjar@cgiar.org

Kamaluddin Prawiranegara

Events Manager

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Jalan CIFOR

Situ Gede, Sindang Barang

Bogor (Barat) 16115

Indonesia

Tel: 62 251 8622 622

Email: mk.prawiranegara@cgiar.org