

First Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

3-4 March, FAO, Rome, Italy
Lebanon Room

END OF MEETING REPORT *(ISPC Secretariat, March 2011)*

Agenda Item 1: Opening Session

Ken Cassman, newly appointed Chair of the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) welcomed Council Members and the Secretariat, international observers, and FAO staff to the first meeting¹ of the newly constituted ISPC.

Ann Tutwiler, DDG Knowledge, FAO provided the host organizations perspective on the Meeting and FAO/CGIAR linkages. She noted that the Organization is a long time supporter of the Independent Science and Partnership Council of the CGIAR (the ISPC; and its forerunners the Technical Advisory Committee and then the Science Council), hosting its Secretariat in a relationship that goes back to the mid-1980's. The FAO provides about one third of its budget (1.3 million USD out of about 3.5) to the ISPC. The existence of the Secretariat at FAO provides an opportunity for an additional interface and knowledge exchange between FAO and the CGIAR. FAO recognises the similarity of the goals of the FAO and the CGIAR with respect to food security, the alleviation of hunger and poverty with due regard for the sustainability of production systems. The specification of a CGIAR new focus on human nutrition provides an additional goal of mutual interest.

The recent external review of the FAO urged closer alignment between the objectives of the Organization and the research programs of the CGIAR. *Tutwiler* noted that this time of restructuring of the CGIAR provides an excellent opportunity to examine where the expertise resident in the FAO divisions and the extensive country-based programs could be of assistance in the crafting of new agricultural research for development programs in a global partnership context. Members of the current and former ISPC, as well as senior CGIAR representatives contribute to the High Level Panel on Food Security and FAO values these contacts and the independent perspectives.

FAO is a member of the CGIAR's Fund Council and sees the Independent Science and Partnership Council and the Secretariat as an important point of contact. The FAO has formed a set of CGIAR liaison scientists to help maximise planning opportunities. She identified FAO's substantial analytical capacity in trend and scenario analysis – which underpins the several "State of..." Reports could be valuable for the ISPC's own foresight work, as well as that of the CGIAR more

¹ Although the Meeting had been styled as the third meeting of the ISPC, it was noted that the previous two meetings held in 2010, were of the interim ISPC and would be reflected as such in the Council's records. This meeting therefore constitutes the first full meeting of the ISPC per se.

generally. There are overlapping interests in the fields of sustainable production, and the forthcoming Science Forum focussed on "The Agriculture-environment nexus" could be a forum in which several aspects of the work and perspectives of FAO's NR Department would be relevant. There is a perhaps untapped potential of FAO capacities in information, extension and capacity development to enhance the outcomes and impacts of the new CGIAR programs.

The DDG appreciated that the new ISPC has chosen to start its life by meeting at FAO in Rome, and looked forward to building mutual knowledge as several new principals took up posts in their respective organizations. She wished the Council and observers a productive meeting.

Ken Cassman thanked FAO for its support to the Council and the Secretariat. He then took the opportunity to introduce the members of the newly constituted ISPC. Besides himself as Chair, these include *Derek Byerlee* (continuing Chair of SPIA), *Jeff Sayer* (continuing ISPC Member) and new members, *Vibha Darwan*, *Maggie Gill* (who joined the meeting virtually), *Rashid Hassan* and *Marcio Miranda Santos*.

Agenda Item 2: Update and discussion on the transition of the CGIAR

i. Update from the Chair

The Chair introduced the item by reminding the new Council of the reasons for the current change process in the CGIAR and he reviewed progress with the establishments of new elements and key individuals. He reported on developments since he was invited to take office in 2010. Working from his home base at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, USA, in late 2010 he had met with CGIAR Chair, Inger Andersen, World Bank and Fund Office personnel. He had orientation meetings with the ISPC Secretariat in Rome and conferred with outgoing Chair Rudy Rabbinge; met with CGIAR Consortium Board Chair, Carlos Perez del Castillo. He had visited IFAD (to get a donor perspectives on the CGIAR transformation), and participated in a number of US-based meetings relevant to issues confronting the CGIAR (e.g. USAID and APLU Feed the Future Workshop, Purdue University; Symposium on Estimating Earth's Carrying Capacity, AAAS meeting, Washington DC). His perception was that there was increasing recognition of agriculture's pivotal role in economic development and in contributing to the MDGs. The current food price crisis emphasizes links between food security and political stability, and provides a reminder that the 2008 price spike was not an isolated event. All those consulted recognize the importance of the CGIAR in global partnerships to address food security, poverty and under-nutrition in developing countries. He believes that there is a major opportunity to capitalize on the transformation process to increase relevance and funding of the CGIAR.

A first virtual meeting of the newly constituted ISPC had been held in January by teleconference. He noted that despite this being the first face to face meeting of the new Council, the ISPC had swung quickly into action and he had provided comments to the Consortium Board (CB) on draft version of the Strategic Results Framework document (and these would be addressed further below) and the new Council had provided a review of the revised CCAFS-CRP proposal.

The Council met for two days prior to the current meeting and had oriented its work around the current ISPC Work Plan & Budget for 2011, noting particularly the challenge to the Program Evaluation function to provide review of up to 13 CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs). The Council expected to comment further on the Strategic Results Framework (SRF), to undertake the planning and implementation of the Science Forum (October in Beijing, co-hosted by the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, CAAS), and continue with a suite of impact assessment activities. There would be a need to develop a new ISPC Work Plan & Budget for 2012/2013 (for consolidated consideration with system office functions in October 2011) and he appealed to the Consortium and to the Center DGs (through their colleagues attending the meeting) to identify

where the independent stance of the ISPC could help them, and the strategic and program development of the CGIAR through foresight reviews and other activities.

ii. Update from the Consortium

Lloyd Le Page, Consortium CEO, suggested that after the tremendous amount of analysis that had accompanied the transition it was a time to move to action. There was a need to invest in long term programs to address the root causes of the food security crisis. He noted that the CB had recently held a meeting at ICRISAT, had approved the release of the new SRF, and appointed *Agnes Mwang'ombe* as a new member. From the first week of March, most of the Consortium Office staff would be establishing in Montpellier, and the CEO welcomed the continuing support of Agropolis, the Region Languedoc-Roussillon, and the Government of France. There were continuing challenges, such as the need to work on the legal documents, including some of the key 'roadblocks' such as the perceived disincentive for Centres for fund raising outside the Fund. As it is not clear if the The Fund will reach previously anticipated levels, it was critical that this be resolved. He pointed out concerns on rising system costs, and that the system funders were expecting better management of these costs from all the system components.

He noted that the SRF utilises the earlier work's done by the CB and Centers and is the outcome of a writing team of experts under the guidance of the Consortium Board and with review by eminent individuals. It may be necessary to trim the document for marketing purposes back to its strategic principles, but the SRF should be seen as an evolving document, targeted at the four new SLOs and which addresses governance and institutional requirements. The CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) are the key instrument to achieve the SLOs. Funding to the first two endorsed CRPs has been delayed pending endorsement of an SRF and finalisation of legal documents. *Le Page* reported that at the end of March, the GRiSP would hold an M&E workshop which it was hoped would evolve some of the thinking and principles that could be applied to the development of M&E plans for other CRPs. He suggested that it was anticipated that the Consortium Board would approve a significant number of proposals including: CRP2, Market policy; CRP6, Forests, trees and agroforestry; CRP3.1 Wheat and CRP3.2 Maize. More generally, *Le Page* noted that as programs are developed there are sets of continuing work for each area: several CRPs take into account existing work (tied funding) and there is a need to move considerations onto a longer programmatic time frame. There were some need for clarity among CRPs on boundary issues and discussions across CRPs needed to improve. The Consortium had undertaken three scoping studies, on gender, gene bank costs and genetic resources issues in the CGIAR. A paper had been developed to suggest how Gene-bank funding from Window 1 funds might continue in 2011. He noted several continuing needs including: increased priority setting at the sub-CRP level; relatively low partner budgets and need for a more strategic agenda; and, in the long term, needs for refinement of efficiencies, particularly management of the increased complexity of CRPs and Centers. Another key area was the need for a more harmonised reporting process, and discussions on how to grow the Fund. He saw two required steps; the realignment of CRPs in 2011/12 with the new SRF and the organisation of discussions amongst CRPs. Second generation issues, from 2012 onwards, would be discussions on combined implementation and cross cutting themes across CRPs. [Discussion of this item is treated under part iv.]

iii. Update on the Establishment of an Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IAE)

John Markie (consultant to the Fund Council on the IAE) gave an overview of the process that he and his fellow consultant *Julia Compton* are engaged in between February and November 2011 to elaborate a suitable mechanism for evaluation in the CGIAR. *Markie* highlighted that the objective of evaluation in the CGIAR is to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the system as a whole. The task for the new evaluation arrangement is to ensure that evaluation becomes less duplicative of effort and that the demands on staff time at all levels in the system are reduced.

The terms of reference for the consultancy include the overall evaluation framework, institutional arrangements, and policy and standards for evaluation in the CGIAR system, as well as the specific mechanisms for evaluation of CRPs and periodic evaluation of the CGIAR system as a whole. *Markie* outlined that evaluation in these terms covers in course and ex-post evaluation, as distinct from any form of ex-ante analysis, which should more properly be called appraisal. Evaluation is either fully or partially independent of those carrying out the research programs and should focus on:

Relevance and results: Efficiency; probability of having impact on beneficiaries; comparative advantage of the CGIAR; quality of science

Coherence: Clear strategic direction; appropriate and effective partnerships

Effectiveness of governance and management: Capacity for responsiveness; management of change; management of risks; donor behaviour and influence on the system

In consulting on their inception report, the team found that the CB and the Centers do not question the need for independence but want the IEA to service their needs as well as the Fund Council's. There is no appetite for revisiting the separation of evaluation from the ISPC, but links should be maintained to ensure coherence. SPIA should be maintained for impact assessment as their strong reputation was evident in the consultations to date.

The proposal in the inception report is that the Consortium and the Fund Council will share an independent evaluation resource (IEA) which will provide common support for the Centers in evaluation with common standards. IEA will lead and drive coherence in the evaluation system and ensure common availability of evaluation information. Impact assessment is to be coherent with, but kept separate from, evaluation. An evaluation follow-up system will be put in place with a structured learning loop to program design and involving the ISPC. In addition, all parties will be able to comment on the IEA's work program, ToRs and draft reports. ISPC can provide its comments to Fund Council, CB and concerned Centers. Evaluation will build from the bottom-up with validation by the IEA.

A draft inception report is now available for comments before being sent to the Fund Council in the 3rd week of March. A final set of proposals, draft evaluation guidance notes and other outputs from the consultancy will be available by November 2011, and a full consultation period will follow. The Fund Council should also make a decision on the institutional mechanisms for the IEA by November. *Markie* invited the ISPC and observers to participate in a dialogue throughout the assignment. Alternatively, written comments on the inception and final reports can be submitted directly to the Fund Council.

The Meeting largely welcomed the consultative process and the outline as presented. It was observed that by comparison with the external visit style of reviews in other agencies, the CGIAR processes, such as those managed by the ISPC previously, gave much more in depth perceptions which were useful to the Centers and Funders alike.

The Chair noted that whatever structure was to be developed for the IEA it should reinforce the structure of the CGIAR and allow the CRPs to respond nimbly. There is lots of history in ISPC and elsewhere for the team to draw upon in evaluation and impact assessment.

iv. Discussion of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF)

The Chair, in introducing the ISPC's views on the most recent version of the SRF submitted by the Consortium Board (before its consideration by the Fund Council or Funders Forum) stated that the ISPC considers that the SRF is the key document underpinning the reform of the CGIAR. The ISPC Chair had been able to comment on a draft of the new SRF prepared before the Consortium Board Meeting in February. The Council had read the subsequent version and have recently received the slightly revised version of the 20th February.

The new report had several positive aspects: it provided a more comprehensive description of current and dynamic context for agriculture and proposed to target the CGIAR portfolio of activities strategically to tackle 4 System Level Outcomes (deriving from MDGs and CGIAR Vision). These are: Reducing rural poverty; Improving food security; Improving nutrition and health; and Sustainable management of natural resources. Tackling the SLOs will involve core competencies (currently defined as being in Productivity/Commodities, Natural resource management, and Social science and policy research. The SRF suggests that these will have to expand to encompass Production systems, Climate change and Nutrition and health.

The SRF therefore intends to provide a rationale for CRP structure which derives from SLOs. The components of this strategy are to: align research across the 15 Centers around strategies to impact on the SLOs; achieve efficiencies; develop new competencies; and guard high quality. The document describes critical core principles which include: a strategic approach to organizing research around impact on the four SLOs; the intention to integrate research across core competencies; and to seeks clarity on, and differentiation of, partnerships at the various stages of the R&D process.

These are all positive aspects of good new writing compared with earlier versions. However, the ISPC finds that the SRF does not provide the framework for bringing the portfolio of CRPs into line with the strategic objectives. Indeed the the SRF is not a *results* framework and pushes the responsibility for defining activities, and the pathways for outputs, outcomes and impacts to the level of the CRP and even to the operational plan level. The Chair noted that if there is a need to accept this document (to maintain flow of funds) there also needs to be a timetable for its revision so that it can function as an SRF. He stated that acceptance of the document should not automatically lead to acceptance of the 15CRPs that have been proposed, as this would lock the system into an unsubstantiated set with little opportunity for change. Finally, he noted that the continuing absence of an adequate SRF makes reviews of the individual CRPs difficult for the Council, as each CRP must be treated on its own merit and synergies, boundaries and potential cross-cutting themes cannot be properly evaluated.

In discussion of the SRF and the Consortium CEO's report it was noted that the simultaneous processes of SRF and CRP development resulted in a lack of clarity in several areas. We would need a road map to effectively move forward. The Consortium CEO thought that the detail could be linked through the anticipated operational plans. The current SRF was a lost opportunity to rationalize the 15 CRPs being advanced. There was a lack of priority setting which early SRF teams had attempted and, in this sense, the SRF had gone backwards. Whilst the difficulties of the start-up process were recognized, the CGIAR needs a focus for decision making. It may be better to consider the CRPs as a flexible portfolio to be actively managed. If the SRF is also considered as one in an iterative series, the strategy had to be balanced with greater awareness of how the changes would be made. If, in part, the CRP budgets are tied to existing work, there needs to be a means to prioritize how additional funds will be spent. A donor perspective was that to keep the momentum, largely lost since Maputo, we need a system marketing tool. Then the CRPs have to be made concrete as donors could not fund simply against titles. Even if we have winning CRPs donors are seeking efficiency from the new system.

The Chair, in summary, noted that the CGIAR still required an SRF that could guide the system. The ISPC was aware of the necessary speed for CRP review but said that there also needed to be a timetable for revision of the SRF if it was truly a living document.

v. Report of the Fund Office and a timeline for the consideration of CGIAR Research Programs

Manny Lantin of the Fund Office gave the apologies of Acting Executive Secretary Fiona Douglas, as she was meeting with the Chair of the CGIAR. He noted that the Fund is fully established and has been operating since December 2010. He noted that apart from the IEA (discussed above) all other entities of the new CGIAR structure are in place. The Fund Office has been restructured from the former CGIAR Secretariat office, and was projecting a budget of USD1.3 million less as some functions move to the Consortium Office. A new Executive Secretary of the Fund Office, Jonathan Wadsworth, would report on the 14th of March. The Office had managed the ISPC selection process, and a number of the Fund and CGIAR establishment agreements. He noted that there was a new Fund Council website and of course the first 2 new CRPs had been endorsed.

A total of USD 646 million had been contributed in 2010, and similar or greater levels were expected in 2011 with a target of USD 1 billion by 2012. Contributions to the CGIAR so far for 2011 totalled USD 454 million (USD 372 million Fund and USD 82 million bilateral monies). Disbursement could begin upon completion of the Joint Agreement and the SRF. World Bank Funding will be disbursed through Window 1 of the Fund. (Window 1 is for generally assigned funds, Window 2 represents CRP-specific funding, and Window 3 funding to Centers in the transitional year).

Although the Consortium CEO had advertised the release of four CRPs for potential review, participants noted the likely addition of the CRP proposals on Drylands, Livestock and fish, and Water, land and ecosystems, possibly amongst others. The Chair noted that the ISPC had not been informed of this and it was difficult to organise timely reviews which would include the assembly of peer review panels, if this was the case.

vi. IP White paper

The Consortium CEO noted that commonly-shared IP principles were part of the common requirements for the system. A draft briefing paper is being prepared and would be available shortly for stakeholder discussion. It intended to describe the principles for the governance of current intellectual assets and the maintenance of access to these. Similarly there was a need to continue to access inward-bound IP and to make appropriate stewardship arrangements so as to maximise opportunities for downstream use.

vii. Common Reporting paper

The Consortium CEO noted that whilst a draft outline for the content of such a paper had been shared with an Ad-hoc group, further development of the paper would await the outcomes of the consultancy on the Independent Evaluation Arrangement in the CGIAR. The intention was to produce a mechanism that would cover 90% of the requirements for donors and try to reduce the excessive reporting burden on Centers and Programs. He further noted that GRiSP, the first CRP to be endorsed, was holding a meeting on monitoring and evaluation of that program (to which the ISPC would send a participant) and it was hoped that these discussions would provide general blue-prints or indications for how the M&E function for programs would be taken forward in the future.

Agenda Item 3: ISPC Discussion on specific CPRs

Update on the Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security CRP (CCAFS) – Thomas Rosswall

In his presentation and on behalf of CIAT, *Thomas Rosswall*, Chair of the steering Committee, CCAFS, reminded the meeting of the four components of the CRP on Climate Change, Agriculture

and Food Security. Three “place-based” Themes will identify and test technologies, practices and policies, and will enhance partnerships, to decrease the vulnerability of rural communities to a variable and changing climate: Theme 1 – Adaptation to Progressive Climate Change; Theme 2 – Adaptation through Managing Climate Risk; and Theme 3 – Pro-poor Climate Change Mitigation. The fourth Theme –Integration for Decision Making – provides a framework for the whole of MP7, ensures effective engagement of rural communities and institutional and policy stakeholders, grounds MP7 in the policy context, and provides downscaled analyses of, and tools for, future climates. *Rosswall* indicated the program would work on the relations between improved environmental health, improved rural livelihoods and improved food security. Eventually the aims of the CRP will be to enhance adaptive capacity in agricultural, NORM and food systems. He noted that the Program is approved in principle and that its development built on the previous Challenge Program of the CGIAR with the Earth System Science Partnership (ESP.). The Program indeed engages all 15 Centres and the Challenge Program Steering Committee is responsible in the interim for CRP7. It was noted that an Independent Scientific Panel will be appointed by the CIAT Board in May and will meet in November, and that the CRP needs Fund Council decision on 2011 funding.

He reported that the ISPC review comments were discussed by CIAT DG, CCAFS Management Team and the Chair SC, and were found insightful, constructive and helpful. They will be further deliberated on next month and will influence several aspects of the early implementation. He agreed that items that require immediate attention are the speed in addressing eight regions with unrealistically ambitious goals for implementation, and strategic directions for work on underutilized crops. Issues for program implementation included smart learning, tools to identify vulnerabilities, adaptive capacity, including an understanding of what the agricultural community will require from the climate science. On another hand, items on which CCAFS disagreed with the ISPC assessment are to be found in Theme 1 “Adaptation to progressive climate change” where the program asserts that the theme encompasses much more than traditional CGIAR research. He felt that the steps being taken and the participation of all 15 Centers would make the program better overall.

Maize and Wheat - presentation by CIMMYT

Marianne Banziger, DDG-research of CIMMYT, the lead Center for CRP 3.1 and 3.2 (wheat and maize, respectively), highlighted the key aspects of the two CRPs in her presentation. CIMMYT DG, Thomas Lumpkin contributed to the discussion through an audio link. The rationale for both of the Programs is in the predicted increase in the global demand for these cereals; threats to productivity increases; documented stagnation in yield growth; and near and medium-term food price predictions.

The specific challenges for maize include: uncontrolled expansion of area; dependency on rainfed conditions; and issues of resilience, sustainability and productivity increases. With wheat they include: effects of climate change; threats of new pathogen strains; and decreasing input requirements while increasing productivity. Both programs have broad geographic target areas; Maize CRP targets “new breadbaskets” where the private sector is not active, and includes about 10 prioritised Strategic Initiatives (SI) a common theme being genetic resources. *Banzinger* explained briefly the development history, partnerships and the programs. Performance contracts, for instance regarding requirement for full cost recovery, are seen as creating disincentives and uncertainty for bilateral funding and for primary non-CGIAR funded partners. It is unclear what the CGIAR can offer. The critique from CRP proponents is that the CGIAR funding approach may restrict funding if funding gaps are proposed and there is lack of recognition and penalties for investors.

The ISPC in its comments recognised the considerable work done to develop the CRP programs during the past half a year, with clear priority setting process for locations, targets and impact pathways. The main issues raised in the discussion included:

- Increased role of agronomy is very positive and multidisciplinary approaches are needed for targeting poverty alleviation. However, the subsequently more complex impact pathways involve both learning and risk. Poor capacity among partners is an issue. ICT can play an important role.
- CRPs development regarding funds available from the CGIAR and whether focus on good and strategic research can be maintained if CRPs open up to significant bilateral funding.
- Labor saving technologies will be important in the African “bread baskets”.
- In areas where natural areas are at risk to be converted into farming, geographic targeting based on good maps allow more subtle understanding of shifts and opportunities.
- The energy agenda should in some way merge with the agriculture agenda for providing solutions to deal with competition between food and energy. However, livestock is also a major driver for maize, and the CGIAR’s linkages with policy makers need addressing.
- Increasingly larger proportion of income is spent on food without necessarily reaching goals of good nutrition.
- Post-harvest has traditionally been overlooked in the CGIAR and yet it is an important component in eventual food security.
- The Consortium is addressing performance contract issues at the highest level.
- On the issue of measuring poverty alleviation at a standard income per day definition that is important for donors, a different strategy would be to monitor outcomes and progress towards impacts at a 10-15 year time span.
- The risk of increasing bureaucracy and distance between different actors was recognised.

v. Market Policy – Video presentation by IFPRI

Shenggen Fan, DG of IFPRI, the lead Center for CRP 2 (policies, institutions and governance), provided the overall rationale for and importance of this CRP in terms of addressing the key food security challenges in the future. Innovations not just in productivity oriented technology, but in policies and institutions are required in order to support income growth and achieve global food security in the future. The CRP is a genuine collaboration between IFPRI, other CGIAR Centers and numerous external partners and exploits the comparative advantage of partnerships. (Center representatives at the meeting spoke highly about IFPRI’s cooperative management style). The DG also noted the IPG nature of this work, impact pathways (informing, influencing and changing policies) using a mix of methods and the importance of feedback and a management structure that minimizes transactions costs.

This CRP addresses three themes: (i) policies and investments to support pro-poor growth; (ii) institutions and governance for the poor; and (iii) value chains and markets. The first theme emphasizes the need to apply research-based knowledge for generating better policies which in turn lead to higher growth. There are six component activities of theme (i): strategic foresight and scenario development; research into macro-economic and trade policies; policies and institutions that focus on poor rural women and men; social protection policies; public investment in agriculture and rural areas; and, research into policy processes.

The second theme focuses on a range of topics related to governance and institutions and has three formal component activities: governance arrangements for services to the poor; collective action and property rights (linking all CGIAR Centers and CRPs); and, institutions ability to strengthen the assets of the poor (e.g., human, land and social capital). There is also a strong and explicit gender component and partnership focus in this theme.

The final theme relates to value chains and markets – focused on developing new opportunities for small producers. The two sub-components are: innovations across the value chains for greater market efficiencies and a comprehensive strategy to upgrade value chains across CGIAR commodities.

Some questions from the members and observers related to:

- spelling out more carefully (hopefully in the document) the challenges inherent in and possibilities for overcoming constraints for the uptake of policy reforms and new institutions.
- strong orientation toward IFPRI, rather than the CRP, but hopefully the document will show how other Centers contribute (especially to the value chains component).
- the strategic foresight component, which is currently the global futures project, involves 8 Centers but the question now becomes where does this type of activity fit best in the System, within the Consortium Office or with a lead Center?
- the value in assembling case studies from all around the world, e.g., zero hunger in Brazil and small farmer program for learning lessons;
- conceptualizing impact, and how to best organize research- by theme or by country group?
- partnerships, and using FAO as a natural partner to help with the impact
- a comparative advantage of the CGIAR is knowledge of agriculture and feeding that into the global trade models (parametrizing the model), e.g., the GTAP model
- need to emphasize science-based policy (as done in USA, Brazil, UK, etc.), otherwise we are in a science policy vacuum.

Agenda Item 4: Forestry and Tree research in the CGIAR

Frances Seymour, CIFOR Director General, gave a presentation of CRP 6 “Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: livelihoods, landscapes and governance”. *Dennis Garrity*, World Agroforestry Centre Director General, complemented the presentation by reinforcing the food security aspect of this CRP and the important role that agroforestry can play in this regards.

This research program brings together four CGIAR Centers (Bioversity, CIAT, CIFOR and the World Agroforestry Centre) which will work together with partners to enhance the management and use of forests, agroforestry and tree genetic resources across the landscape from forests to farms. *Seymour* described the conceptual framework and background on which the CRP is based, its objectives and aspirations, the impact, communication and partnership strategies as well as the management structure. She highlighted the importance of forests for rural livelihood (e.g. 90% of the 1.4 billion people living in extreme poverty depend on forest resources for some part of their livelihoods), for food security (e.g. nearly half of agricultural land has more than 10% tree cover) and for the environment (e.g. forest systems provide environmental services important to the agriculture sector, including hydrological regulation and pollination, as well as fodder and soil fertility enhancement). Among other things, CRP6 will undertake to enhance trees on-farm contributions to productivity, food security and conservation of natural resources.

The drafting of the CRP 6 followed an extensive consultation process. Between end of May 2010 and February 2011 it involved more than 300 national and international partners and independent reviewers. The 15 Centers were involved and linkages were drawn with CRPs, especially with CRP 7 “Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security”, CRP 2 “Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen; Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor” and CRP 5 “Water, Land and Ecosystems”. The final proposal was submitted to the Consortium Board on 7th February and to the ISPC on March 3rd. The CRP will be presented for approval at April 2011 Fund Council.

The CRP 6 is founded on five components, with increasing scales (from farm, to community forest, landscape, and global level): i) Smallholder production systems and markets; ii) Management and conservation of forest and tree resources; iii) Environmental services and landscape management; iv) Climate change adaptation and mitigation; v) Impacts of trade and investment on forests and people. Each component is then divided into Research themes. The Research Program is characterized by “Sentinel Landscape”, a concept shaped on the basis of recommendations from the 2009 Social Science Stripe Review (CGIAR Science Council, 2009). Research in these landscapes will aim at generating data such as the drivers and impacts of land use change and approaches to

threats and benefits for environmental resilience and the poor. This data could not be obtained with the use of remote sensing techniques only. Research in these sites will also integrate research and impact pathways to exploit potential synergies across all CRP6 components (and potentially other CRPs). *Seymour* stressed that this crosscutting component would be implemented only if adequate funds will be secured. Another important crosscutting component is gender, with key research questions and activities built in each component.

CGIAR system will work with several types of “external” partners (Research; Policy and Practice; and Knowledge-sharing) at different levels (International; Regional; and Country or local) both to implement the program but also to learn from previous projects. CRP6 will target approximately 500 million people living in or close to forests and will require a minimum (“Business as usual +”) of 234 million USD to be implemented; the budget is proposed to rise to 293 million USD for a “what it takes” scenario. Although review and approval process is still in train, work has already started for the establishment of the CRP6 infrastructure and the first steering committee took place in February. Final planning and budgeting are expected for June 2011.

While not wishing to provide statements prior to its formal review, the members of the Council were appreciative of the presentation and commended the efforts of all the CGIAR staff involved in the preparation of the CRP. Special mention was made to the value added of bringing in a large community of practice and on the concept of the “Sentinel Landscapes” including the International Public Goods that might originate from these. ISPC suggested setting clear criteria to help in the process of selection and planning of such sites. Comments were also made on the importance of highlighting the impacts this CRP might have on global policy and clearly setting performance indicators. ISPC recognized that the implementation of such an ambitious program might be a challenge and recommended keeping the program flexible enough to leave space to learn and fine tune during the implementation. Suggestion was also made for the Consortium to think of innovative approaches and incentives to encourage collaborations among CRPs once in operation.

During the discussions both CIFOR and World Agroforestry Center clarified that their research has been already aligned to the “new CGIAR” and that therefore high percentages of their ongoing portfolio is already included in the CRP (99% and 65% respectively).

Donor representatives also took the opportunity to seek clarification on the number of CRP to be submitted for potential approval at the April Fund Council. The Chair confirmed that final decision on this point would be made by the Consortium. With regards to the independent review the ISPC deliver to the donors, the Chair confirmed that a full independent review process requires a minimum of four weeks. With this consideration in mind, the full reviews of CRP 2 and CRP 6, which were submitted by the Consortium to the ISPC on March 3rd, will be shared with the donors before the Fund Council. Donors and participants endorsed this approach. The ISPC also clarified that it would not be involved in interim reviews of CRPs before their formal submission by the CB, since this would compromise the independence of the formal review. If asked, ISPC could however share ready available publications and past reviews (including of other CRPs) which could help the Centers in their undertakings.

Agenda Item 5: Strategy and Trends

The Chair introduced the Agenda Item noting that the foresight area was a very important one for the ISPC and the Council sought to find an independent role which complemented the current and future development of the SRF and the Centers and programs of the system. He noted that at the request of the Fund Council, the ISPC had intended to focus its efforts in the current biennium on two practical studies; a study of genetic resources in the CGIAR (which had not been initiated as the Consortium had instituted a scoping study with similar terms of reference) and a study of the CGIAR’s NRM research and issues affecting impacts at scale.

Jeffrey Sayer, ISPC Member and Professor of Development Practice at the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University, presented the “*Natural resources management research challenges and way forward for the new CGIAR – An NRMR Stripe Review*”, an activity planned by the ISPC under its “foresight studies” mandated area for the year 2010-2011. The study was inspired by the success of the “Stripe Review of Social Science in the CGIAR” and aims at assisting the CGIAR System in developing quality NRMR programs by sharing insights, perspectives and factors which influence achieving impact at scale from NRM research. *Sayer* explained that, for the purposes of the study, NRM research is defined as research that produces effective technologies, policies, systems and social organisation or that will reduce the cost of: i) Soil water and nutrient management at all scales from the field to the landscape or water catchment; ii) Sustainable production increases; iii) Efficient allocation and use of land; iv) Optimises the balance amongst multiple ecosystem functions. Poverty alleviation, food security, socio-economic benefits and sustainable use of natural resources are points of concern in this context.

The NRMR Stripe review is an “independent but participatory” study based on three learning layers: i) Learning from the past (CGIAR NRMR assessments, EPMR, Plans, material uploaded on the Centers’ web, etc); ii) Learning from outside (through the collaboration of four internationally experts); and iii) Learning from in-house expertise (through consultations with Centers and Challenge Programs, learning from other promising programs as well as from less successful work). The results of the Study will feed into the debates and discussions at the Science Forum 2011, with the final output, a strategic paper, expected by November 2011.

Sayer extended the invitation to collaborate to all Centers’ DG and leaders of Challenge Programs and informed that detailed concept note would be shared with them soon.

ISPC members, and participants welcomed the initiative. It was noted that results from this study might also incite an interesting policy debate, to be potentially linked to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. It was felt that one of the advantages of the study would be the bringing of external perspectives into the debate and recommendations were put forward for the study to learn from international NRM research and to help place the CGIAR’s NRM research in a global context. It was made clear that the study intended to include the relevant Challenge Programs also.

In more general discussion on the foresight area, the Chair invited suggestions (now and in the future) from the Consortium, the Center DGs and program leaders on areas in which an independent think tank such as the ISPC could add most value to the CGIAR. It was noted that there are currently many research and development organizations conducting global and sectoral studies. The ISPC would not attempt to duplicate such efforts (which any way required large sustained budgets). There was however an opportunity to build greater policy effectiveness on the basis of the CGIAR’s accumulated science. The ISPC would put together a statement on its approach which would guide its contributions in the next workplan.

The Consortium CEO suggested several areas where he thought such as assistance would be welcome including:

- A methodology that might be used by the Consortium for prioritizing programmatic investments at a high level.
- Projecting who will be farming beyond 2030 and analysis if this will affect the comparative advantage of the CGIAR (noting rural and urban migration rates and balances and the ageing of the agricultural work force.)
- Productivity, and how to increase the rate of productivity gains in sub-optimal areas with out affecting sustainability and the resilience of systems.
- Noting the populations basic dependence on 7 major crops for calorie dependence, how do we expand the food basket of developing countries to include vegetables and fruits?

- What are the scientific developments in the next 7-10 years that affect the way the CGIAR does business and how will new technologies be disseminated in a safe and efficient manner.

The Chair thanked him for these indications and invited DGs and donors to think of possible additions.

Agenda Item 6: Summary

The Chair summarised the day's discussions noting that the SRF could not be considered a final document and that it would evolve. It needed, as well as the several issues covered in discussion, to include defined metrics of poverty and food security. The ISPC had appreciated the presentation of the CRPs and detected a learning process of the desirable elements to be included in proposals, noting that the CGIAR initiated its first experience of CRP development only in 2010. He welcomed the update from CCAFS, looked forward to seeing the maize and wheat proposals, but wondered, noting the size of the Forestry proposal whether there was some happy medium to be reached in regards to proposal length. The ISPC would be happy to continue to have a dialogue with the IEA consultants on the basis of their draft and the further elaboration of their recommendations.

Agenda Item 7: Implications of the Lessons Learned from the SSA-CP for the design of research for development programs

John Lynam, the Chair of the recent External Review of the Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program (SSA-CP), discussed the implications that the SSA-CP experiences and the expected results have for the future of CGIAR Research Programs and ways of pursuing sustainable outcomes and impacts, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The External Review report and the interim ISPC's commentary have been already forwarded to the Fund Council.

The IAR4D operates on the principle assumption that through an approach that integrates productivity, markets and resource management and operates through institutional partnerships (including other sectors than research) the probability of impact on development outcomes and particularly direct and primary impact increases. The intention is to influence direct impacts through research on development. Impact assessment *ex post* deals with successful technologies - but defining the impact pathway for single technologies *ex post* has limited implications for future research investment. The SSA-CP became a research on development platform which operates on multiple benchmark sites and chose the randomized control trial approach, as suggested by the Science Council, to evaluate the IAR4D concept. The results and outputs from the CGIAR Centers are inputs into the SSA-CP and are being tested. The RCT approach is very novel, with limited experiences with this evaluation "gold standard" in the development context so far. Although the RCT method is intended to provide rigorous comparative evidence about the IAR4D there are several challenges including: conflict between the principle of adaptive management, particularly for NRM and the strict requirements particularly for the control sites in the RCT over a sufficiently long time to allow measurement; challenges of randomization, variability and representativeness of, and comparability across, benchmark sites; conflict between the rigid conditions of the RCT design and the objectives of development partners; and time and costs for generating sufficient data from the RCT and thus the conclusiveness of the results. The SSA-CP also raises the question of designing research explicitly for regional versus global effects and subsequently developing regional versus global public goods. The critical issue for the SSA-CP is that due to unrealistic estimates of time and resources to complete the RCT experiment, the Program needs more time, but its future in the CGIAR transition has not been secured.

Adewale Adenkunle, the Coordinator of the SSA-CP provided further explanation of the Innovation platforms for institutional partnerships. The platforms are a forum among different players to identify constraints, suitable technology outputs from research for instance, and ways to make these

outputs usable. They also generate research demands - for the CGIAR among others - to address. Other main issues raised in the discussion included;

- It is recognised that integration of the SSA-CP to forthcoming CRPs is too delayed and too uncertain given that the integration has not been started during the CRP development stage.
- The lessons are important for development of CRPs to consider development impact pathways, partnerships and the CGIAR' role in the interface of strategic research and development outcomes. It was noted that studies on proof of application could also be a role for the CGIAR.
- The Consortium would like to strengthen the program in a way that can make the lessons replicable. Regional activities have been examined to determine if Centers in other regions can play the regional role in a more meaningful way.
- Regarding *ex post* impact assessment and lessons for future research; broader evaluation of the benefits from successful cases requires sufficient numbers to show patterns; in the SSA-CP such cases have been too few so far.
- When, where and at what cost should RCTs be used? The IAR4D implementation could be evaluated through some other rigorous evaluation methods which ought to be considered. Recommendations could derive from this experience on appropriate evaluation methods for IAR4D and all value chain approaches.
- In the design of the approaches it is also important to consider the scaling up context which may be very different from piloting. For instance public-private partnerships will be an issue. The SSA-CP considers that the organizational platforms allow scaling up issues to be addressed as well.
- A Center observer expressed the concern that the RCT is clouding the actual context of the IAR4D. It is creating partner fatigue as it is difficult to see what costs are additional transaction costs and what are necessary mechanisms in a very complex system.
- Some observers suggested more debate on how international public goods requirements affect partnerships. The SSA-CP considers that it is contributing to IPGs as well as RPGs.
- Partnerships have a critical role to deliver new innovations, knowledge etc. and the issue is how the CGIAR will empower and engage partners to deliver. For the ISPC it is a critical issue in reviewing the impact pathways in CRP proposals.
- As concluded by the interim ISPC in its commentary to the review, the ISPC considers it important to complete the evaluation of SSA-CP experiment and document its lessons, and for doing this funding needs to be provided. The costs to finalise the results are marginal.
- It was noted that institutional set-up of these kinds of programs is very hard and it would be a disservice to stop the activities when they are going on. The transactions to get CRPs started should not derail the ongoing program, which seems to have promise over many other place-based approaches. Those CRPs considering place-based approach need to learn from this experience.

Agenda Item 8: Update on SPIA Activities

Derek Byerlee, SPIA Chair, gave an overview of SPIA's current activities in the context of a revised strategy and operational plan for 2011-2013. He summarized the challenges facing impact assessment in the CGIAR, and hence SPIA's challenges, as relating to (i) 'deepening' impact assessment, i.e., improving methods for undertaking studies on the impact of research on poverty, food security, gender and the environment, and addressing more difficult research areas not yet subject to assessment, e.g., genetic resources, livestock and irrigation management; (ii) maintaining the CGIAR's flagship areas of impact, especially in crop improvement, which is of considerable interest to donors; (iii) keeping up with the rigor revolution in impact assessment; (iv) feeding impact assessment into SRF and CRPs more explicitly; and (v) addressing the weak capacity in the Centres for impact assessment, both in financial and human resources. These challenges call for adopting a slightly different business model than in the past, where SPIA relies more on externally commissioned impact assessments with increased budget and staff to fulfill the needs of donors for high quality system level impact analysis.

Byerlee then provided an update on progress with five studies SPIA is currently undertaking. The *Diffusion and Impact of Improved Varieties in Africa* (DIIVA, 2010 - 2012) is a large grant-funded 3-year project addressing the need to update previous information and measuring impacts in a flagship area of the CGIAR in Sub-Saharan Africa. More than 100 crop-country combinations are being covered in this study and all seven commodity improvement Centers with crop mandates relevant for Africa are involved. A mid-term project meeting was held in Bamako in January 2011 and reviewed progress. A synthesis of first results is expected by December 2011. SPIA continues to monitor and ensure quality control of the project through the Steering Committee.

A study, *Environmental Impact Assessment of CGIAR Research* (EIA, 2009-2011) is now in its final stages with a compendium report targeted for May 2011. The major impetus for this study was the need to build up an inventory of credible environmental impact assessments and develop appropriate methods for measurement and valuation. There were four components to this multi-phase study: (i) Two scoping study reports (Djurfeldt et al 2009; Bennett 2009) provided a conceptual background and explored various measurement and valuation methodologies for documenting social and environmental impacts from agricultural research; (ii) Six EIA Center case studies commissioned by SPIA (ICARDA, IWMI, CIP, CIAT, WorldAgroforestry and ICAR) with external consultants providing technical assistance and guidance; (iii) An independent report reviewing the empirical literature with an analytical framework for assessing a range of environmental effects (+ and -) that result from agricultural research; and, (iv) a review paper by SPIA examining the evidence of the impact of research-led agricultural productivity increases on deforestation (or land saving) with a trade model developed by Purdue University simulating the impact of 'no crop germplasm improvement' over the past 30 years. The EIA Study report will consolidate these various elements. A key outcome of this study is that the lack of documented *ex-post* evidence of environmental impacts in the CGIAR is as much a consequence of the lack of relevant data and lack of clear incentives at the system level (given the high cost and serious commitment required to get good biophysical data on changes in agricultural systems) as it is lack of appropriate methods. The CGIAR is underinvested in datasets required for more integrated (economic plus environmental plus social) *ex-post* IA. Lack of impact itself may be a contributory cause.

A study of the *Impacts of CGIAR research on poverty and under-nutrition* (2010 - 2013) was launched last year. The goal is to assess the extent to which technical change in agriculture has differential effects on different indicators of wellbeing, including poverty levels, hunger and food security, and nutrition. In December 2010, SPIA and IFPRI organized a brainstorming workshop in Washington to take stock of recent advances in methods and data to more rigorously assess the impacts of CGIAR research on reducing poverty and hunger, and to help design future CGIAR work in this area. A key decision was to initiate a set of case studies, both at the micro and macro levels, to broaden and deepen impact assessment of agricultural research on poverty and hunger. A total budget of approximately USD 500,000 is available for the first component of the study, to be allocated (competitively) among two or three poverty impact assessments based on the analysis of household-level datasets. A second component, with a budget of approx. USD 300,000, will be allocated to country-level studies commissioned to and led by IFPRI, that will estimate the impacts of all CGIAR research within that country. These components studies will begin from June 2011.

The aim of the *Germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation* study (GCCCE, 2009-2011) is to measure and value (to the extent possible) impacts from GCCCE related activities by the CGIAR. As past efforts in this sort of assessment have been limited in scope, scale, data and methods, one of the key objectives of this study is to develop a conceptual framework and set of methods that might be applied in future efforts to estimate these types of impacts. The perspective taken with respect to valuation will be derived from the concept of total economic value, which embraces multiple sources of value. SPIA commissioned two background papers in 2010, one by Smale and Hansen focusing on the outputs to outcomes and one by

Robinson focusing on possible cases for assessing impacts on system level goals. SPIA is assessing follow-up in 2011, potentially commissioning a few low-cost case studies to build up evidence of GCCCE impact in the CGIAR.

Over the next three years SPIA will commission systemwide *ex-post* IA in broad thematic areas of CGIAR research which to-date have not been evaluated but for which anecdotal evidence suggests considerable impact, e.g., legume improvement research, livestock management research, irrigation management. The first of these, launched late 2011 is the “*Stripe*” *impact assessment of Legume research* (2011 - 2012) which will assess the cumulative impacts of legume research across the system for pigeonpea, chickpea, lentil, lathyrus, common bean, soybean and cowpea in terms of their economic, social and environmental impacts in specific regions of the world. Legumes are likely to show especially important impacts on gender equity, nutrition, and sustainable soil management. A scoping study has been completed and SPIA will be selecting 3-4 case studies over the next few months.

Finally, *Byerlee* reported on the communication and outreach activities of SPIA via the *CGIAR Impact website*, production and distribution of glossy *impact briefs* and organisation of *special sessions at international conferences*.

In discussion, the *ISPC Chair* noted the importance to and integration of SPIA with the ISPC, e.g., gaining in review of CRPs where plausibility of impact is made explicit. He reflected on the need for improving estimates used in the global trade models – an area where CGIAR scientists/economists could contribute – considering that productivity gains are a necessary but not sufficient condition for land savings. Questions and comments from both Council and Observers ranged over several topics including; the role of learning from *ex post* IA, the need for realistic expectations about doing IAs well after the research has been completed and sufficient time has passed for real impacts to occur—as much as 10-15 years later; the critical importance of carrying on *ex post* IAs of earlier research but within the context of CRPs, the value of SPIA’s work in terms of building an impact culture within the CGIAR, questions about selecting only successes and ignoring ‘failures’, the need for assessing the CGIAR’s contribution to strengthening capacity in the NARS—arguably one of the CGIAR’s biggest achievements, issues of attribution and the potential negative effects of attributing too much to CGIAR, SPIA’s role in identifying acceptable outcomes in the SRF that are acceptable to donors, the use of *ex post* IA to test expectations and measurements from earlier *ex-ante* IAs, the need for ensuring databases are publicly available, and particularly the value of sentinel sites for developing baselines for future *ex post* IAs and as a basis for understanding the drivers of change. The Consortium CEO raised a number of questions about harmonising IA activities within overall M&E processes of the System, responsibilities (and comparative budgets) of the CRPs versus SPIA, capacity building requirements at the System level, and how to ensure the IA pipeline is kept full.

In response, *Byerlee* welcomed the many positive remarks about SPIA, especially those from the CGIAR centers. SPIA has worked closely with the Center IA focal points, which has been a mutually beneficial relationship. *Byerlee* provided clarification or agreed with the importance of these issues – e.g., heroic assumptions in the (land use) models used to estimate effects, the role of learning, measuring attribution, analysing ‘failures’ (although the term is misused; research is inherently uncertain and unpredictable and therefore produces many ‘failures’ which should rather be treated as subjects to learn from), the need for centralised poverty related databases (LSMS), making available databases to the public, and issues related to harmonisation at the System level.

The ISPC Chair closed the session by complimenting *Byerlee* and the SPIA team for developing a highly relevant and impressive agenda.

Agenda Item 9: Update on Mobilizing Science

The Chair began by stating that the ISPC's engagement in mobilizing science is primarily through the CGIAR Science Forum (the first of the new biennial series of meetings was held in 2009). He stated that the ISPC's engagement in partnerships will be principally by providing advice on the partnership elements of CRPs, suggesting specific partners where they are considered absent.

Jeff Sayer presented an update on the Science Forum, beginning with a short outline of the goals of the Science Forum series (which are, briefly, to explore a key emerging issue relevant to all centers but not explicitly addressed in existing CRPs or in other fora, which is critical to the CGIAR, important for society and relevant to the private sector, and to generate new collaborative opportunities for the CGIAR).

Science Forum 2009 had been held in Wageningen, the Netherlands, in June 2009, on the theme of 'Science for Development,' with 300 participants from 55 countries, covering 6 sub-themes, engaging 42 speakers and panellists (almost half of which came from the CGIAR System, and almost half from universities and public research institutes). A special edition of the journal *Crop Science* dedicated to the Science Forum, published 14 papers that had been presented at the meeting. One of the issues that emerged from Science Forum 2009 was the need for a facilitated space in the CGIAR to explore current thinking on the interplay between the need to increase agricultural production and long-term stewardship of natural resources and the environment. The need for the CGIAR to engage more with the BRICS countries also emerged at the Science Forum and in other CGIAR discussion fora since.

These concerns had prompted the formulation of Science Forum 2011 and Sayer related the plans that had been made to date. It will be held in Beijing on 17-19 October, on the theme of *the agriculture-environment nexus*. Science Forum will be hosted by the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS) and is being organised by a steering committee led by the ISPC. It is proposed that, similar to Science Forum 2009, numbers of participants are limited and delegates in parallel workshop sessions will be asked to address a set of key questions on the central theme; doubling food production in times of resource scarcity, climate change, and population growth without further environmental destruction and natural resource depletion. As with Science Forum 2009, a special issue of a high-impact journal is planned. Participants were invited to comment on the short-list of proposed parallel session themes². Participants highlighted some current research being conducted in these areas by scientists within the CGIAR, FAO and other research institutes and suggested its inclusion in the programme. YPARD highlighted the inclusion in Science Forum 2009 of some researchers who are in the early stages of their careers, and proposed that similar early-career researchers from fields relevant to the theme should also participate in Science Forum 2011. Maggie Gill (ISPC member) emphasised that in commentaries about livestock the negative environmental impacts tend to prevail. However, she cautioned against omitting to highlight the many positive social and economic impacts that livestock farming bring.

There was no discussion of Mobilizing Science activities other than the Science Forum and this would need to be addressed in the development of the next WorkPlan and Budget.

² (including: Sustainability Science- Producing more with less; Will large scale land conversion feed the poor? Land saving - Concentrating production in favoured areas; Can biodiverse farming systems compete in globalised markets? Predicting the future: A review of foresight, models and scenarios; Metrics - Measuring the multiple products and values of agricultural lands; Ecological intensification - Can carbon flows be reversed? Livestock and aquaculture - Reducing the environmental impacts; Agriculture beyond the peaks - Technologies for phosphorous, potassium, water and fossil fuels; Concepts and success stories for eco-efficient agriculture; Food from the trees - opportunities for tree crops in low potential areas etc.).

Agenda Item 10: How the ISPC will work in the Future

The Chair reported that the ISPC had taken advantage of their earlier closed meeting to define the Council's Operational strategy with near term and longer term perspectives.

For the near term (2011) the intention is to complete the WorkPlan and current activities with existing Member/Secretariat responsibilities. Noting the large program reviewing load the Council would complete the review tasks on an *ad hoc* basis according to Council expertise and pools of expert peers. It would keep the panel mode of operation for SPIA, appointing two new Panel members and maintain flexibility in other activity areas, not relying on a panel structure per se.

Tasks for the longer term included the need to draft a new Workplan and budget for 2012/2013 by September 2011 (ISPC2). Before then there would be the need for (i) an ISPC paper on its approach to foresight with consultation on topics identified, (ii) Confirmation of the ISPC's approach to the P in partnership, (iii) update and broaden lists of matching expertise and individuals identified to act as peer reviewers, leaders of anticipated studies and "star professors" who might be associated with ISPC studies and reviews over longer periods. There may be a need to balance or appoint secretariat expertise against new tasks (new foresight, communications or partnership analysis etc.).

The Executive Director reported that the near term includes adoption of a *communications strategy* for ISPC outputs. The elements of the strategy included the development of a revised ISPC website and the use of new communications tools such as an electronic newsletter, targeted e-mail alerts etc.. The ISPC would continue and develop the briefs series, and develop better communication channels for the outputs of the Science Forum. The Council would continue to hold specialized workshops, explore options for formal co-publication, trial selected social networking tools (in relation to its own events) and place increased emphasis on the importance of personal approaches and channels to other CGIAR and external stakeholders. The Council was provided with the test *url* for the new website and invited to provide their comments and inputs.

In discussion it was noted that there would be a need to stagger the work load in the review of CRPs. The foresight paper would be largely for the benefit of the ISPC but would be available for comment. The initiative in communications was welcomed and there should be ways of getting feedback on the Council's outputs. Efficacy would be helped by timely uploading of materials onto the website. The ISPC would consider an internal electronic workspace for managing large documents and commentaries etc but final materials should be made public. There should be a consistent message to improve the quality of science.

Agenda Item 11: Any other business and closing

The only other business was the confirmation of the next meeting. This was not available at the time (but during the writing of this report has been confirmed as 14th to 16th September, at CIMMYT, Mexico.

There being no other business, the Chair closed the meeting.

Independent Science & Partnership Council

First Meeting
3 - 4 March 2011

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ISPC MEMBERS

Kenneth G Cassman, ISPC Chair, Director, Nebraska Center for Energy Science Research, and Heuermann Professor of Agronomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Tel: +1 402 472 3852 (Energy Center), e-mail: kcassman@unlnotes.unl.edu
kcassman1@unl.edu

Derek Byerlee, SPIA, Chair, Georgetown Ct NW, Washington DC 20007, USA
Tel: +1 202 905 0497, e-mail: dbyerlee@gmail.com

Margaret Gill (Via video link) Chief Scientific Adviser, Rural & Environment Research & Analysis Directorate Spur Q, Saughton House, Broomhouse Drive Edinburgh EH11 3XD, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 0300 244 6686, e-mail: m.gill@abdn.ac.uk

Vibha Dhawan, Executive Director (Planning and Coordination), TERI, Darbari Seth Block, Habitat Place, Lodhi Rd. New Delhi 110 003, India
Tel: +91 11 2468 2100/2111, ext. 2606, e-mail: vibhad@teri.res.in

Jeff Sayer, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University, Box 6811, Cairns, Queensland 4870, Australia
Phone: +61 7 4042 1663 (office), Fax: +61 7 4042 1284 (office)
Mobile: +61 4 1862 8110, e-mail: jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au

Marcio de Miranda Santos, Executive Director, Center for Strategic Studies and Management Science, Technology and Innovation (CGEE), SCN Quandra 02 Bloco A Ed. Corporate Financial Center, 11 fl, Brasilia DF 70 712-900, Brazil
Tel: +55 61 3424-9601/+55 61 3424-9601, e-mail: mmiranda@cgee.org.br

Hassan Rashid, Dept of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa
Tel: +27 12 420 3317, e-mail: rashid.hassan@up.ac.za

ISPC STANDING PANEL MEMBERS

Mywish K. Maredia, Deputy Director, Bean/Cowpea CRSP, 321 Agriculture Hall Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1039, USA
Phone: +1 517 353 6602, Fax: +1 517 432 1073, e-mail: maredia@msu.edu

OBSERVERS

Guido Gryseels, Director, The Royal Museum for Central Africa, Leuvensesteenweg 13, 3080 Tervuren, Belgium
Tel:(+32) 02 769 52 11, e-mail: ggryseels@africamuseum.be

Tony Simons, Deputy Director General, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), United Nations Avenue, Gigiri, PO Box 30677 , Nairobi 10100, Kenya
Tel: + 254 20 722 4000, e-mail: t.simons@cgiar.org

Marianne Banziger, CIMMYT Deputy Director General, Km. 45, Carretera Mexico-Veracruz, El Batan, Texcoco, Edo. de México, CP 56130 México
Tel: +52(595) 9521900, e-mail: m.banziger@cgiar.org

Manuel M. Lantin, Science Adviser, CGIAR Secretariat
The World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433 U.S.A
Tel: +1 202 473 8912, Fax: +1 202 473-8110, E-mail: m.lantin@cgiar.org

Thomas Lumpkin (Via Video Link), CIMMYT Director General, Km. 45, Carretera Mexico-Veracruz, El Batan, Texcoco, Edo. de México, CP 56130 México
Tel: +52 595 9521900, e-mail: t.lumpkin@cgiar.org

Dennis Garrity, Director General, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri, PO Box 30677-00100 GPO, Nairobi, Kenya
tel:+254 20 7224000, Via USA: +1 650833 6545, Fax:+254 20 7224001
Via USA fax +1 650833 6646, e-mail: icraf@cgiar.org

Meredith Soule, Research Advisor USAID/EGAT/ESP 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC, U.S.A. 20523-3800
Tel: +1 202 712 1058, e-mail: msoule@usaid.gov

Lloyd Le Page, CEO, CGIAR Consortium Office, c/o FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Viale del Terme Caracalla, Rome, Italy
e-mail: L.LePage@cgiar.org

Frances Seymour, Director General, Center for International Forestry Research
Mailing address: P.O. Box 0113 BOCBD, Bogor 16000, Indonesia
Office address: Jalan CIFOR, Situ Gede – Sindangbarang, Bogor Barat 16115, INDONESIA. Tel: +62 251 8622622, email: f.seymour@cgiar.org

Adewale Adekunle, Coordinator, Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program, Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), Gowa Close, Roman Ridge, P.M.B CT 173
Accra, Ghana
e-mail: aadekunle@fara-africa.org

Thomas Rosswall, Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change (CCAFS)
e-mail: thomas.rosswall@gmail.com

Alain Vidal, Director, CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food, P.O. Box 2075
Colombo, Sri Lanka
Tel: +94 11 288 0153, +33 4 67 04 75 77, e-mail: A.Vidal@cgiar.org

John Lynam, Rockefeller Foundation, P.O.Box 47543, Nairobi Kenya
Tel: +254 2 228061, e-mail: johnklynam@gmail.com

Kwesi Atta-Krah, Deputy Director General, Bioversity International

Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel. +39-06 61181, fax. +39 06 61979661, e-mail: bioversity-europe@cgiar.org

Marlene Diekmann, GIZ, Wissenschaftliche Beratung / Research Advisor,
Beratungsgruppe Entwicklungsorientierte Agrarforschung (BEAF), (Advisory Service on
Agricultural Research for Development), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Dahlmannstr. 4 , 53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49 228 24934 212, e-mail: marlene.diekmann@giz.de

John Markie, Consultant, Fund Council
e-mail: john.markie@windowslive.com

Carmen Thönnissen, Senior Advisor, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA),
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Corporate Domain Global
Cooperation, Global Programme Food Security, Freiburgstrasse 130, 3003 Bern,
Büronummer 214, Switzerland
Tel. +41 31 322 03 05, e-mail: carmen.thoennissen@deza.admin.ch

Pai-Yei Whung, Adviser, Agriculture and Rural Development, Sustainable
Development Network, The World Bank, 1818 H Street, NW, Washington DC, 20433,
U.S.A. Mail Stop - MC5 – 514.
Tel +1 202 458 0170, e-mail: pwhung@worldbank.org

Mark Holderness, Executive Secretary, Global Forum on Agricultural Research
(GFAR) Secretariat, c/o FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Viale delle
Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. e-mail: mark.holderness@fao.org
Tel: +39 06 570 55047, Fax: +39 06 570 53898

Ajit Maru, Senior Knowledge Officer, Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR)
Secretariat, OEKD, FAO, Rome, Italy, B 648,OEKD, FAO, Viale delle Terme di
Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 570 54022, Fax: +39 06 570 53898, e-mail: ajit.maru@fao.org

Courtney Paisley, Coordinator, YPARD - Young Professionals' Platform on
Agricultural Research for Development, Hosted by GFAR Secretariat c/o FAO, Food
and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome,
Italy. e-mail: courtney.paisley@fao.org , Tel: +39 06 570 54614, Fax: +39 06 570
53898, www.ypard.net

George Rothschild, 4 Swan Cottages, The Green, Offham, West Malling, Kent, ME19
5NN, UK, Tel/fax: +44 (0) 1732 872179, email: george.rothschild@btopenworld.com

Rodney Cooke, Director, Policy and Technical Advisory Division, Programme
Management Department International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD),
Via Paolo di Dono, 44-00142 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39-06-54592450 email: r.cooke@ifad.org

Emily Collins, Adviser (Agriculture), Australian Embassy, Via Antonio Bosio, 5 00100
Rome, Italy. Tel: +39 06 8527 2319, email : Emily.Collins@dfat.gov.au

Karin Nichterlein, Agriculture Research Officer, FAO, OEKR, Food and Agricultural
Organization of the UN, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
e-mail: karin.nichterlein@fao.org , Tel: +39 06 570 55529

Ann Tutwiler, Deputy Director General, Knowledge, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. Tel: +39 06 570 53117

Anton Mangstl, Director of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension (OEK), FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. e-mail: anton.mangstl@fao.org , Tel: +39 06 570 53579

Alexander Müller, Assistant Director-General, Natural Resource Department, FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy. e-mail: Alexander.muller@fao.org , Tel: +39 06 570 53037

Samuel Jutzi, Director, Animal production and Health division, \ FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy E-mail: Samuel.jutzi@fao.org Tel: +39 06 570 53371

Gabriella D'Elia, Programme Officer ,Research and Development in Agriculture for the MDGs initiative, Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare, Via A. Cocchi 4, 50131 Firenze. Tel: +39 055 5061304, delia@iao.florence.it , www.iao.florence.it

ISPC SECRETARIAT

Peter Gardiner, Executive Director, CGIAR ISPC Secretariat, FAO, OEKD, C-628, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 57052458, e-mail: Peter.Gardiner@fao.org

Christine Deane, Senior Agricultural Research Officer, CGIAR ISPC Secretariat, FAO, OEKD, C-636, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 0657055659, e-mail: Christine.Deane@fao.org

Sirkka Immonen, Senior Agricultural Research Officer, CGIAR ISPC Secretariat, FAO, OEKD, C-634, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 57054861, e-mail: Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org

Timothy Kelley, Senior Agricultural Research Officer, CGIAR ISPC Secretariat, FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, OEKD, C-632, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 57054210, e-mail: Timothy.Kelley@fao.org

James Stevenson, Agricultural Research Officer, CGIAR ISPC Secretariat, FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, OEKD, C-633, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 57052252, e-mail: James.Stevenson@fao.org

Serena Fortuna, Consultant – c/o FAO, OEK, Natural Resources Management, CGIAR Independent Science & Partnership Council, c/o FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, Room C-631, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel. +39 06 570 56091, e-mail: serena.fortuna@fao.org

BIOVERSITY INTERNATIONAL

Emile Frison, Director General, Bioversity International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 066118247, email: e.frison@cgiar.org

Elisabetta Gotor, Bioersity International, Via dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057
Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118370 (direct), e-mail: e.gotor@cgiar.org

Michael Halewood, Senior Scientist, Head, Policy Research and Support Unit,
Bioersity International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118294, e-mail: m.halewood@cgiar.org

Carlo Fadda, Senior Scientist, Understanding and Managing Biodiversity, Bioersity
International, c/o ICRAF, PO Box 30677, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +25 420722450, email: c.fadda@cgiar.org

Mauricio Bellon, Director, Diversity for Livelihoods Programme, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118336, email: m.bellon@cgiar.org

Adam Drucker, Senior Economist, Diversity for Livelihoods Programme, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118391, email: a.drucker@cgiar.org

Pablo Eyzaguirre, Senior Scientist, Diversity for Livelihoods Programme, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118267, email: p.eyzaguirre@cgiar.org

Devra Jarvis, Senior Scientist, Diversity for Livelihoods Programme, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118414, email: d.jarvis@cgiar.org

Laura Snook, Director, Understanding and Managing Biodiversity, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118343, email: l.snook@cgiar.org

Stefan Weise, Director, Commodities for Livelihoods, Bioersity International, Parc
Scientifique Agropolis II, 34397 Montpellier Cedex 5, Montpellier, France
Tel: +33 467611302, email: s.weise@cgiar.org

Toby Hodgkin, Principal Scientist, Global Partnerships Programme, Bioersity
International, Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118212, email: t.hodgkin@cgiar.org

Michael Mackay, GENESYS Project Principal Investigator, Bioersity International,
Via Dei Tre Denari 472/a, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 6118235, email: m.mackay@cgiar.org

**ISPC visit to Bioversity International HQ
Wednesday 2 March 2011
Sakura Room, Ground floor**

1400	Bus collection from FAO
1445 - 1500	Emile Frison, Director General - Overview of Bioversity International's Research Programme
1500 - 1510	Carlo Fadda "Seeds for adapting to future climates" (CRP7 - Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security)
1510 - 1520	Mauricio Bellon "Using Agricultural Biodiversity to improve livelihoods in dry land areas" (CRP1.1 - Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for Dry Areas)
1520 - 1530	Adam Drucker "From Farm to Fork" (CRP2 - Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen Assets and Agricultural Incomes for the Poor)
1530 - 1540	Pablo Eyzaguirre "Improving Nutrition with Agricultural Biodiversity: Putting quality food on the food security agenda" (CRP4 - Agriculture for improved nutrition and health)
1540 - 1550	Devra Jarvis "Ecosystems, Resilience and Sustainability" (CRP5 - Water, Land and Ecosystems)
1550 - 1600	Laura Snook "Trees and Forests: Balancing Conservation and Use" (CRP6 - Forest, Trees and Agroforestry)
1600 - 1615	Questions
1615 - 1630	<i>Coffee (outside Sakura Room)</i>
1630 - 1640	Stefan Weise, "Making bananas work for smallholders" (CRP3.4 - Roots, Tubers, and Bananas for Food Security and Income)
1640 - 1650	Toby Hodgkin "The Value of Conservation Research"
1650 - 1700	Michael Halewood "Policies that support use and conservation of genetic resources"
1700 - 1710	Michael Mackay "Accelerating research outcomes through Informatics"
1710 - 1745	Questions and discussion
1745	<i>Cocktail</i>
1830/1900	Bus back to Rome