

9th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

13-14 March 2014

IFPRI, Washington DC, United States of America

END OF MEETING REPORT

(ISPC Secretariat, April 2014)

Agenda item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

Welcome and opening from ISPC Chair

Jeffrey Sayer, Acting ISPC Chair, opened the meeting noting how pleased the ISPC was to have convened at IFPRI in Washington for the first time. He recognised the numerous important documents and the information resource that IFPRI provided for the CGIAR system and beyond. The most recent example was IFPRI's launch of the 2013 Global Food Policy Report. He welcomed observers to the meeting, including Wayne Powell, the new Chief Scientific Officer of the Consortium, with whom the ISPC hope to form strong links. He noted that the meeting had been preceded by a full day's workshop as part of the ISPC's study of Biotechnology in the CGIAR and that the present meeting would address, amongst other new areas, the report of another major study, on metrics and he welcomed the participation of Panel Chair Ken Giller who would report on that study during the meeting.

He then informed the meeting that following completion of a Fund Office-managed selection process Maggie Gill was the ISPC Chair elect. Given she had been a former Council Member, the selection process had confirmed the nomination of two new Panel members (Segenet Kelemu of Ethiopia and Tom Tomich of the USA). He welcomed them all and invited Maggie Gill to preside over the remainder of the meeting.

Maggie Gill then added her welcome to the participants and endorsed her pleasure at being at IFPRI. She said that she was delighted to work on the large body of work that the ISPC had before them in a team approach and looked forward to the feedback of others into the work of the Council.

Welcome and opening from the IFPRI DG: Shenggen Fan

Shenggen Fan welcomed the ISPC to IFPRI and noted that IFPRI had been seeking interaction with the various system units and was delighted that the ISPC had responded. In his view, the ISPC plays an important role in the CGIAR addressing the science quality and relevance of CGIAR science as well as the impact of its programs. The Council's review and approval processes for the SRF and the CRPs were part of the quality assurance of the system. He welcomed all participants and looked forward to a scientific Agenda.

Agenda item 2. IFPRI in 2014

Shenggen Fan, DG of IFPRI, opened the agenda item by reflecting on the agricultural sector, IFPRI's strategy, and evolution in the new CGIAR. He noted that the agriculture sector is transforming rapidly, and this brings up the question of how best we can help smallholders move up or out of the sector. Social safety net programs are needed to ensure these farmers in transition do not slip into poverty. He also observed that agriculture and food systems continue to become more vulnerable. The factors that influenced the 2007-08 crisis remain (climate change, energy crisis, conflicts etc.). The increase in

food prices last month (due to the drought in Brazil and conflict in Ukraine) underline the significant role of such factors.

Fan reported that the new IFPRI strategy focuses on sustainable food production, healthy food systems (beyond quantity), building resilience at all levels, strengthening institutions and governance, transforming agriculture, and improving markets and trade. In line with these strategic changes and in contrast to 10-15 years ago, one-third of the IFPRI staff is in the field (one-fourth in Africa). While IFPRI leads two CRPs i.e. PIM and A4NH, there continue to be research areas such as urban poverty, the rural non-farm economy, building resilience etc. that IFPRI considers critical and fit the SRF but are not directly dealt with in any of the 15 CRPs. He spoke about how in addition to production, consumption, trade and markets - a more traditional focus - IFPRI now looks at health and nutrition, and sustainability as well. The DG then presented key IFPRI research outputs and outcomes by strategic areas¹. He identified the following as key challenges for agricultural research and development in 2014: the lack of consensus on targets around food and nutrition security for the post-2015 agenda; high food inflation in middle-income countries; resistance to science-based solutions to food and nutrition security; increased risk of protectionism by emerging countries; and the risk of complacency, and the (potential) resulting reduction in agricultural research investments and increased protectionism in emerging economies.

The CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) also expands the traditional production focus to include nutrition/health, hunger reduction, and natural resources management, he noted, however, it is important to review whether the Consortium has met the original goals as laid out by Kathy Sierra when the system was first developed: simplicity and clarity of governance, greater efficiency and effectiveness, clear strategic focus, avoidance of overly centralized decision-making, and active subsidiarity.

Discussion: In response to the Council's question on how IFPRI conducts research and the link to their foresight modelling efforts, Fan said that IFPRI had been working on the IMPACT model for over 20 years and the strength of that model lies in combining economic models with biophysical models. The foresight modelling effort is now a flagship research component of PIM on which 12 Centers are working to identify 20 technologies that may be appropriate for the world as a whole. Another question from the Council focused on how IFPRI approaches areas that are *not* undergoing the rapid transformational changes that Fan referenced. For instance, in Africa, where the population is growing and where the manufacturing sector may not be able to absorb the working age population. Fan responded that this necessitates a typology of farmers and identifying a different bundle of strategies for each type. For example, commercial farmers need access to markets and an enabling policy environment whereas subsistence farmers may need social safety nets, migration and training. Brooks noted that the CRPs approach this question by asking how they can get people off the farm, and (in PIM) by examining opportunities for young people participating in agriculture, what constrains their transformation, and the issue of inter-generational transfer of resources.

Responding to other questions, the DG explained how some of IFPRI's key publications have shifted the impact assessment agenda. For instance, the Copenhagen Consensus Center ranked an IFPRI paper on combatting under-nutrition in pre-schoolers as the single most important investment opportunity of the 16 they reviewed. He noted that IFPRI is heavily involved in the development of national plans for African countries and, in a few cases like Ethiopia and Rwanda, the Center is examining implementation and evaluating impact.

a) PIM CRP progress update

Karen Brooks, CRP Leader, outlined the work carried out over the first eighteen months of the CRP on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM). The CRP is funded through bilateral sources and window 3 (65%), with the remainder through Windows 1 and 2. CIMMYT recently joined the CRP bringing

¹ See: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/shenggen-ifpri-in-2014-9th-meeting-of-ispc>

the total number of participating Centers to twelve. There have been some adjustments in the structure of the program to accommodate a new architecture of flagships and clusters, and with a strong results orientation. Each of the eight flagships contributes to an Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO), with the exception of cross-cutting work, which contributes to all IDOs.

Flagship research areas include *inter alia*: Foresight modelling; Science policy and incentives for innovation; and Natural Resource Property Regimes. Examples of IDOs used by PIM include: Improved prioritization of the global agricultural research effort; Increased adoption of superior technologies and management practices; Improved policies that increase security of rights to natural resources and assets for women and the poor. A number of short-run successes from the CRP were highlighted, notably a Randomized Control Trial (RCT) on cash transfers in Ecuador, the positive results of which were picked up by *The Economist*, contributing to a better understanding of a need for a variety of instruments of social protection suitable for different circumstances.

In reflecting on how the introduction of the CRP has influenced work in social sciences and economics in the CGIAR, Brooks affirmed the commitment on the part of the scientists to keep doing excellent research, but noted that the CRP is quite demanding in terms of transaction costs. Where there are clear synergies then these are worth it, but in other areas (such as in the work on global trade) the research is all carried out by IFPRI and there are other examples of high degrees of specialization for other Centers. Other concerns relate to how the reporting system for the CGIAR does not yet support a focus on impact and that the programming schedules of CRP and partner organizations may not be well-aligned.

b) Contribution to defining a system-level results framework

Brooks briefly outlined the efforts of PIM to develop IDOs, and related these to the progress in SLO and IDO working groups developing indicators for the CGIAR system. Eleven common IDOs for the CGIAR as a whole have been adopted by the IDO working group and cover the following areas: productivity, income, adaptive capacity, future options, food security, gender and empowerment, policies, nutrition, capacity to innovate, environment and climate. These outcome areas help focus attention on impact and how to achieve it but Brooks believes that the IDOs without accompanying metrics cannot serve as a workable results framework for the CGIAR – that IDOs without indicators are “over-praised and under-dressed”, and even with indicators (targets) defined, there will still be issues of attribution. Critical to the success will be a framework provided by a Strategy and Results Framework document for the system as a whole. New capacity to collect and process data will lead to breakthroughs in the near future but this potential has to be harnessed by a simple conceptual framework broad enough to do justice to the underlying complexity and to integrate the CRPs. Brooks outlined her own perspective on the building blocks for this framework, working back from what will be required to achieve a food secure future - Technology; Efficiency; Trade; Social protection. These can then help guide the definition of a limited set of indicators to show how progress made in these areas map to the CGIAR system. There is an agreement with the Fund Council that changes in high level indicators are not to be attributed to the CGIAR because of ownership of the development process by developing countries, and the contributions of many other partners. Indicators for the CGIAR system can be aligned with those for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), but need not coincide due to the different origin of the two sets of indicators. In Brooks’ view, indicators cannot be used for results-based allocation of resources – the *ex ante* problems of uncertainty in results chains are too great. Brooks made the personal suggestion that Window 1 allocations be used primarily for public goods of the CGIAR system and that the residual be divided equally across CRPs. Donors could then decide on Window 2 allocations individually.

In discussion, Maggie Gill suggested that system-wide topics and perspectives should be discussed in the later session on metrics, and that questions and comments should focus on the earlier part of the presentation on the PIM CRP. Jeff Sayer and Marcio de Miranda Santos asked about the foresight modelling work carried out by PIM, and particularly how possible it is to make revisions to the IMPACT model to reflect greater complexity. Brooks acknowledged that foresight modelling has its limitations, and noted that taking technologies that can be sufficiently characterized by crop modellers

and providing an interaction between them and economic, social and climate models is a worthwhile input to the process of understanding future challenges. They are currently working with farming systems scientists / agronomists to characterize more complex systems (e.g. agroforestry) to recognize them as technologies and incorporate them. Looking forward, Brooks noted that it isn't possible to have just one approach to resource allocation – that increasingly we are able to look at probabilistic states of nature with advances in computing power by running the model multiple times – but that this is not the only input to the resource allocation process. Ken Giller pressed further on the capabilities of such modelling approaches arguing that by modelling directly at country level misses the main constraints which are at the level of individual households.

Frank Rijsberman acknowledged that he had perhaps praised the progress made on IDOs before they were finished – and agreed that a lot more still needs to be done in defining these and working towards agreement on indicator targets. Graham Thiele thanked Karen Brooks for her insights into the challenges that are shared among all CRPs, particularly that CRPs are missing opportunities with partners and with donors because of a mismatch on schedules. Thiele pleaded for a more flexible schedule and a multi-year commitment from the Fund to allow CRPs to take advantage of emerging opportunities.

4. Mapping CRP sites - prioritization of CGIAR activities for phase 2

Melanie Bacou spoke to the rationale for the work conducted by the Harvest Choice program which was designed to provide the CGIAR and its partners with key indicators for the system's research investment. The intent was to map agricultural investments and technologies and the location and reach of CGIAR research programs for improved planning, targeting and accountability. Collating the locations for the CGIAR's research and development areas, programs and actors would allow a count of activities by location, with allocated budget and full time equivalent researchers and the opportunity to review possible allocation across the new system, commodity value chains and technologies. The attempt would also support investment analysis, identification of gaps and opportunities and foster targeting with partners at regional, national, and local scale.

Bacou noted that elements of investment mapping are embedded in a number of CGIAR initiatives and other multi-partner alliances (CGIAR reform leading to the Open Access policy; AgTrials; SAKSS/ReSAKSS; ASTI; the Dublin process which was looking at investment mapping and alignment; AATP/the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition; and IATI - which monitors aid flows by source, recipient and sector). These provide many opportunities for synergies but also for potential duplication of effort. The CGIAR effort had been initiated in mid-2012 and mapping had been handed over to the Consortium for Spatial Information (CSI) in March of 2013. At that stage they identified key CSI coordinators and the CRP focal points for the curation and sharing of CRP agricultural domain maps. There was now a shared IATI data scheme for characterising activities and locations by OECD/DAC standards and, by April 2014, a web-based CGIAR research portfolio for visualisation and data entry would be released. To derive user-centric data collection tools, a draft data schema and harmonised code lists will have to be defined. Bacou hopes that the program would then proceed to specific sector analysis - beginning with livestock (and a technical consultation and mapping workshop is anticipated, including ILRI and partners in the Horn of Africa). Bacou noted that the map that Karen Brooks presented was an interim version until such time as the web-based application was available which could be actively updated by CRPs and maps developed according to theme.

In discussion, Marlene Diekmann noted that GIZ were also mapping CGIAR activities to track and help provide justification for their investments and this would be shared to identify whether there were opportunities for CRP collaboration with other GIZ projects and programs and, for instance, to monitor supported students. The speaker also noted the possibility of linking to a library system of monitoring and evaluation. Sirkka Immonen reminded those present that up until 2010 the CGIARMap project had a record of investments, whilst Wayne Powell asked about the robustness of

the data, projecting the use of phenotyping site data in the future. He was aware of a University of Indiana software which was also being used to map investments against RforD efforts. Agnes Gassner, ICRAF noted that a lot of project information on land use planning had been collected but there was work to be done to derive synergies. For instance, the CRPs had recently developed a joint theory of change for Burkina Faso. This was useful at the strategic level but was still complicated at the team and implementation levels.

Peter Gardiner introduced a concept note on a Quantitative Framework for Mapping Investments and Impact of CGIAR Research, prepared by former ISPC Chair Ken Cassman after he raised the issue during his last address to the Fund Council in 2013. [Although the raising of this item was delayed to a later session due to time constraints, this is recorded here for relevance.] The concept adds to the idea of building a spatial map of CGIAR investments and commodities by including agro-ecologies and social science data on farm size and the characterisation of farm households (as per the Master's et al. study report) for targeting of research and to take account of the rapid changes in rural demographics to update prioritization. The consensus of the meeting was that the household characterization data requirements could not be met at a global level and that even for a regional (say Africa) level considerable data accumulation and mapping would be required. The ISPC Chair, Maggie Gill, suggested that the responsibility for the development of such a model would be with the Consortium, but the ISPC would be pleased to join in with a think tank on the feasibility of the model development and how the data might be accumulated and modelled as an aid to prioritization.

Agenda item 5. CGIAR update

(i) Report from the ISPC

Maggie Gill, the newly appointed Chair-elect of the ISPC, updated the meeting participants on the current activities of the ISPC. Gill began by noting with appreciation the excellent leadership provided by her predecessor, Ken Cassman, and the important contributions of ISPC member Rashid Hassan, both of whom completed their terms at the end of 2013. At the same time she was pleased to welcome two new members to the ISPC – Thomas Tomich, Professor of Sustainable Food Systems at the University of California, Davis, and Segenet Kelemu, Director General of ICIPE. Since the confirmation of these two new members by the Fund Council (FC) occurred only very recently, unfortunately, neither was able to attend this meeting, although Tom Tomich was expected to join the group via skype for several of the sessions. After describing very briefly the interview and endorsement process for the ISPC Chair and two members, Gill took the opportunity to say how delighted she was to have been chosen to chair the Council and looked forward to working with colleagues in the Council, FC, Fund Office (FO), the Consortium, CRPs and Centers.

Gill briefly touched on a number of completed and on-going activities of the ISPC, many of which would be elaborated on during the course of this meeting. These included the 2013 Science Forum held in September in Bonn entitled “Nutrition and Health Outcomes, targets for Agricultural Research”, co-hosted with BMZ, which explored where and how agriculture can make a difference in nutrition and health impacts; a report of a study evaluating livestock research across CRPs; the publication in Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment of the results of a study on Conservation Agriculture; and ISPC inputs on the revision of the SRF, and Consortium guidelines for the 2nd call for CRP proposals. Two major current activities –discussed in depth under Strategies and Trends (Agenda item 9) – are the Biotechnology and Metrics studies.

(ii). Report from the Consortium

Frank Rijsberman, the Consortium CEO, presented an update from the CGIAR Consortium focusing on several specific issues: the SRF management updates and guidance for the CRP 2nd call; the 6-month extensions for AAS, FTA, and Maize in 2nd half of 2014; the 2-year extension and refresh (2015-2016) proposal round in 2014, the CRP 2nd call (pre-proposals in 2015 and full proposals in 2016); and the Mid-Term Review of the CGIAR (MTR – see below) and IEA reviews. Rijsberman spoke to each of these and hoped to be able to confirm with the “new ISPC” (reference to new Chair

and two new members) the previous agreements with the “old ISPC”. With respect to the 2nd Call for CRPs, Rijsberman highlighted several prerequisites before the call could be launched: (i) that the MTR was completed and recommendations implemented; (ii) external reviews of all CRPs were made available prior to the call for full proposals; and (iii) a renewed (revitalized) SRF was completed. He emphasized that the ‘accountability framework’ had been implicit in the SRF action plan in 2013 (ToC, IP, IDOs), but noted more work was needed for 2014 on identification of indicators and targets. The 2014 SRF update and revitalization plans are expected to be approved by the CB (March 19-20) and FC (May 6-8). The Guidance Workshop held recently in February in Wageningen, hosted by the Consortium Board (CB) and FC, confirmed that the 2015 SRF Management Update should be a ‘revitalization of strategy’ that will show what is needed to achieve the SLOs, including the breadth and scope of the CGIAR strategy to some extent “independent of” the current CRP portfolio.

Rijsberman concluded by raising some questions about the process for review and revision and interaction with the Consortium after the ISPC has commented on the proposals. Specifically, should CRPs respond to ISPC review comments before the CB and FC consider the proposals (and if so, through what mechanism)? This requires clarification in dialogue with the ISPC. The latter issue was reinforced by a comment from the DG of IFPRI who recalled that conflicting reviews had sometimes been received by CRPs – first from the Consortium and later by the ISPC, highlighting the need for coordination and clarity this time around. Rijsberman suggested that the process chosen for the 2nd call - where the ISPC conducted the major review of science - was designed to obviate this. Fan asked how the global challenges of sustainable intensification, and a carbon neutral agriculture, that Rijsberman had raised, might fit into an operational plan of the CRPs. Rijsberman clarified that these areas were meant to narrow and sharpen the focus, a step down from the four broad SLOs and that this strategy would be reflected in the updated SRF. The ISPC Chair concluded the session hoping that recent ISPC studies had been useful to the CRPs and Consortium in updating or revising CRPs or the SRF – a topic likely to be revisited in tomorrow’s discussion.

(iii). Report from the Fund Office

Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary of the Fund Office (FO) presented an overview of the budget and status of CGIAR funds. At the end of 2013, the fund showed a total of US\$703.8 million, with 502.7 million disbursed, leaving a balance of US\$201.1 million. He explained that the total CGIAR fund contributions have been increasing steadily during the last 3 years, but this increase was mainly in Window 3 funding, with both W1 and W2 remaining stable. The pattern of donor disbursements has changed slightly in 2013 compared to 2012, but the FO expects more changes in 2014 due to several multi-year agreements signed in 2013. Wadsworth explained that the quality of funding projections by the FO is improving for planning purposes, with more information available at the beginning of the year due to multi-year agreements, although most funding is received towards the end of the year. The funding projections for 2014, based on estimated indications from communication with donors, shows a total of US\$486.6 million, with US\$182.1 million, 105 million and 199.5 million, for W1, W2 and W3, respectively. Discussing the proportion of W1 and W2 funding to CRPs, Wadsworth described the complementarity between the two windows, with a strong role of W1 when W2 does not attract enough funds.

Wadsworth concluded by informing the participants about a funding study (including the uses and influence exerted by W3 funds – initially acceded to as a transition arrangement - on overall CGIAR strategy) currently being undertaken by the FO and led by Anthony Beattie. This question will be reviewed by the MTR panel. He also reported that the FO had commissioned a study on CGIAR delivery strategy led by the consultancy firm Dalberg. He noted the new staff appointed by the FO in 2013.

In discussion, Shenggen Fan, IFPRI DG commented on the fact that despite the increased performance of the Fund and the good situation of cash flow to the CGIAR, some Centers are still struggling with their level of reserves. He advocated that funding should be mostly devoted to science; he also questioned the division of labour between system offices, wondering if the study on delivery could

have been carried out by the Consortium Office. The Consortium CEO replied that there is discussion currently between the CO and Centers about the size of reserves. He also noted that the total budget for running the system management and offices is still less than the 2% threshold. The ISPC Chair noted that while the ISPC expects the CGIAR funding to be mostly dedicated for research and science, the question of budget accountability to donors also needs to be scrutinized, especially as the size of the funding increases.

(iv). Report from the Secretary of the CGIAR's Mid-Term Review Panel

Warren Evans, member secretary of the panel, presented an update on the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the CGIAR Reform process. The Review will look at the progress of CGIAR reform efforts, as well as the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of the overall system, and will make recommendations for course correction. The panel has been established, with Sir John Beddington, former Government Chief Scientific Advisor in the UK, serving as chair. A CGIAR reference group is composed of four members of the Consortium Board and four members of the FC. The Review was launched in September 2013, interim results will be discussed at the first meeting of the Fund Council in 2014, and the panel recommendations will be adopted at the final Fund Council meeting in 2014. Evans summarized the [Terms of Reference of the MTR](#), which will focus on the following aspects:

1. The appropriateness of the current CGIAR goals and strategies in supporting the fundamental purpose of agricultural research and to deliver research outputs which contribute to development solutions needed to create a world free of hunger;
2. CGIAR's effectiveness in generating and delivering solutions for reducing rural poverty, improving food security and advancing the livelihoods of users of its research;
3. The efficiency and effectiveness of CGIAR's architecture/structure, operations, and mechanisms for managing and funding research programs and building capacity, including its internal systems, risk management, governance and accountability;
4. The extent and quality of partnerships within the CGIAR network and with external collaborators and stakeholders;
5. The structure of the Fund, the challenges of increasing the proportion of commitments to pooled funding (Windows 1 and 2), the prospects for firm multi-year pledges, and the roles of Window 3 and bilateral funding;
6. Measures needed for the CGIAR to continue playing its critical role in global public goods research and national capacity building, and maintain its relevance in a rapidly changing global environment of ODA, more complex and crowded global research architecture, changing roles of public and private research investment, and ever competing demands on donor funding.

Evans reported on the inception meeting held in January in Berlin and the inception report being prepared by the panel. Three specific questions are currently analysed in-depth and commissioned by the Review panel:

- (i) What are the 20 or 30 big issues facing agricultural research and food security in the coming decades? How well is the CGIAR equipped to deal with them in the long and short terms? How should this be improved?
- (ii) Potential for more innovative financing mechanisms - other than relying on ODA. How to generate new funding for agricultural research and for the CGIAR?
- (iii) Is there a potential for the CGIAR to tackle some newer areas like polyculture of perennial grains? Are there similar types of research required to deal with the major challenges identified?

Evans stated that panel members are taking the time to digest the huge amount of documents and reports available, including the CRP governance and management review, the SRF update documents, and the ISPC white papers and reviews. These documents are setting the stage for the work to be done by the Review panel and an MTR inception report will be communicated shortly. The panel review

has also requested the reference group and the Centers to submit narratives of their most important accomplishments, the cost involved and the value for money analysis. Evans concluded by describing briefly the process and the next steps of the MTR.

4. Report of the IEA

Sirkka Immonen, staff of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement, presented an update of IEA activities. The first Rolling Evaluation Workplan (REWP, 2014-2017) developed by IEA and approved by the FC, outlines a vision of the contribution of the IEA to the effectiveness and efficiency of the CGIAR; it describes what the IEA aims to achieve in the next four years, and presents the resources needed. The REWP includes the following main activities:

1. CRP Governance & Management review
2. Review of Generation Challenge Program
3. FC request for CRP evaluations prior to the CRP second call for proposals. This will include the evaluation of 10 CRP by IEA by 2016, and 5 CRP evaluations through IEA-facilitated review and validation studies.
4. Cross-cutting themes (gender, partnerships, capacity building) and Gene Bank CRP evaluation in 2016
5. System-wide evaluation of the CGIAR 2017, including external evaluation of IEA

Immonen presented the IEA's evaluation strategy for supporting CRP evaluation plans, and for building an Evaluation Community of Practice (ECoP). She reported that the first ECoP workshop was held in Rome in October 2013, with over 40 participants from all CRPs and Centers. IEA has also been working on the finalization of the evaluation guidelines and standards. The IEA work plan for 2014 – 2015 includes the evaluation of 5 CRPs in 2014 (FTA, PIM, WHEAT, MAIZE, AAS); 5 CRPs in 2015 (CCAFS, GRiSP, L&F, WLE, RTB); and Review and Validation Framework for self-commissioned reviews for the 5 remaining CRPs (Dryland Systems, Humid Tropics, Dryland Cereals, Grain Legumes, and A4NH). Current IEA activities focus on the development of evaluation “building blocks”, with several CRP Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs) already underway (L&F, A4NH, CCAFS, AAS).

Immonen presented a summary of IEA's Internal Quality Assurance system, which includes the following elements:

- Strengthening standards and guidelines
- Learning from 2013 evaluation work
- Greater standardisation in the approach and methodological tools in CRP evaluations to allow for consistency and comparison across CRPs
- Evaluation Manager's key role.
- Quality Assurance Advisory Panel composed of external senior evaluators
- External review panel for each CRP evaluation

Immonen presented an update on the CRP Governance & Management Review, and highlighted some of its conclusions and recommendations. The Review concluded that the shift in investment from Centers to programs and the uncertainty about the levels and flow of W1 and W2 funds have heightened the sense of risk on the part of Centers and raised concerns about a loss of standing within the system as a whole. The dominant role of Centers, in particular lead Centers, in CRP governance and management may be attributable to the level of Center resources committed to the CRPs, but it negatively affects the legitimacy of CRP decision making. The review also concludes that the strategic oversight of CRPs could be effectively provided by a single CRP governance body with a balanced, independent character that supports the accountability of the lead Center board for the performance of the program. A number of CRPs currently have such an arrangement in place (Humidtropics, CCAFS, GRiSP, WLE and AAS, for example) and the review concluded this to be a functional model. On the

management side, the Review found it impossible to determine CRPs' core management and coordination costs or to make comparisons across CRPs. The management accountability and reporting structures in place for CRP leaders do not provide CRP management with the clarity and authority to manage for results. The Review also concluded that CRPs would benefit from a management structure comparable to the Challenge Program model in which management accountability flows through an independent governance body to the lead Center. Immonen concluded by describing IEA co-operation activities with SPIA and the CO for clarifying the respective roles of the units on CRP monitoring (CO), evaluation (IEA) and impact assessment (SPIA, Centers/CRPs).

Agenda item 6. Independent Program Review

Preparing the 2nd phase CRP review – extension proposal in 2014

Peter Gardiner, Executive Director of the ISPC, presented an update of the ISPC's expected contribution to the CGIAR's call for a second round of CRP development and review to enhance the strategic orientation of the CGIAR portfolio and to bring the CRPs (that began with staggered start dates and initiation periods) into aligned funding. He stated that the three year process would begin with the ISPC reviewing the CRP extension phase proposals in May/June 2014 whilst the target start date for 2nd phase CRPs would be 2017. He further clarified that the extension proposals would be short to confirm direction, utilizing new vocabulary of IDOs, theories of change, as well as geographies of current or new expansion. In mid-2015, the ISPC would review the CRP pre-proposals, i.e. major flagship project components of proposed 2nd phase CRPs. The pre-proposals would also be short and focused on outcomes, theories of change, impact pathways and management arrangements. Additionally, these pre-proposals would be judged more on feasibility and desirability as part of a portfolio rather than science quality. Finally, the CRP full proposals (from a directed call based on pre-proposal review step) for the 2nd phase of CGIAR development would be reviewed in 2016. In conclusion, he stated that towards the end of 2016, the FC would review and make decisions for what would be funded and go forward in 2017.

Several issues regarding the review process were raised. The Consortium CEO indicated that the extension phase proposals would also be a "refresh" process as there had been a refinement in thinking and most CRPs had evolved significantly since their approval. However, there was a lack of clarity as to how much change would be acceptable under the "refresh", mainly because large changes would be difficult to assess on the basis of a short extension proposal.

Marcio de Miranda Santos initiated a substantial discussion regarding the principles/criteria for evaluating the extension proposals, noting that the ISPC regretted the continued absence of a final SRF document that could lead the second phase of CGIAR and CRP development. The criteria for the extension proposals would include, for example, track record - does the CRP have sound justification for proposing new activities? Have the cross-CRP analyses and IDOs been incorporated into future research planning? Has the theory of change been adopted?). Transparency in setting criteria for review was needed since it was critical that the CRP leaders understood what they were being assessed against. Jeff Sayer noted that it was important to look at the proposals to see if they were aligned or at least consistent with the "Grand Challenges". Furthermore, many recent ISPC-commissioned studies contribute to context setting and research planning and it would be useful to see that reflected in the proposals. The possibility of discussions between the ISPC and the CRPs during the review process and opportunities for getting more information from the CRPs in case the ISPC had any concerns was also raised. Finally, Maggie Gill agreed, in response to an observation by the CRPs, that a one page justification (providing the progress to date and future choices relative to CRP history) as an addition to the proposal template should be considered.

Agenda item 7. SIAC - Implementing the 2014 workplan

Doug Gollin, Chair of SPIA, via skype, introduced SPIA and the associated staff who have changed and expanded in response to an increased set of activities under the Strengthening Impact Assessment in the CGIAR (SIAC) program. Erwin Bulte and Karen Macours are leading specific activities under SIAC (a nutrition call for proposals and an RCT call for proposals, respectively) and Bob Herdt has recently joined SPIA as a member, providing around 25 days a year across the SIAC portfolio. Ira Vater was welcomed into the Secretariat as Project Coordinator for SIAC in January 2014. Gollin briefly provided an overview of the dissemination efforts for projects that are wrapping up (DIIVA project, legumes study, poverty impacts study) before giving a detailed account of progress on the SIAC program since the last ISPC meeting.

SIAC represents a significant change in the way that SPIA works –there is a much higher level of funding but other significant shifts involve: a) greater use of competitive calls for proposals; b) broadening the pool of collaborators and expanding contacts with other networks; c) greater coverage across research areas and geographies; d) meeting demands for high levels of rigor; e) more responsiveness to donor demand for specific studies. All of these strategic issues cut across the four objectives of SIAC: 1) to experiment with new methods for estimating adoption; 2) to institutionalize the collection of adoption data; 3) to assess the impact of under-evaluated areas of CGIAR research; 4) to build a community of practice on impact assessment.

Specific projects currently being implemented within SIAC include a major MSU-led effort in testing novel methods to track adoption of improved crop varieties and NRM research related outcomes, relying on DNA fingerprinting in the former case. A significant scaling up of efforts to collect national estimates of adoption for crop germplasm technologies has been launched across South, South-East and East Asia, and processes for natural resource management technologies and policy outcomes are being developed. Following an open call for proposals on nutrition impacts from agricultural research, a set of 11 proposals have been short-listed and externally reviewed, featuring collaborators from a wide range of research institutes, and up to 5 will be commissioned following approval from the SIAC Project Steering Committee. A partnership with the World Bank Living Standards Measurement Survey – Integrated Surveys of Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) will help to institutionalize data on agricultural technologies in national-level panel surveys in eight countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. Finally, a workshop on methodology for assessing poverty impacts will take place at the University of Minnesota on 26th July 2014 that reflects on a number of studies that have been commissioned or SPIA has been involved with over the last few years, and seeks to ask questions about standards and expectations for rigor in demonstrating impacts on poverty from agricultural research.

Gollin responded firstly to questions related to work SPIA is finalising, in particular, the legume research impact study (in which groundnut is included but not grass pea). With respect to varietal turnover, one of the interesting findings from DIIVA has been the continuing importance of some older varieties. Yet, simultaneously, many new varieties are showing uptake in some countries. Persistent (older) varieties may not always mean failure. There is clearly a skewed distribution with a small number of varieties accounting for a large share of area. The average age of varieties in the field in SSA was calculated as 14 years.

Turning to the SIAC program, Gollin responded to a question about SPIA's current strategy of keeping an arm's length distance in the conduct of studies from the CRPs and Centers arguing that this was not inconsistent with SIAC's fourth objective of strengthening IA in the CGIAR. SPIA needs to be able to demonstrate that both Center/CRP and its own IA studies are credible and not viewed as part of the internal system. The quality rating system will provide an incentive for enhancing rigor in ex post impact assessment (epIA) studies, including SPIA studies. However, playing a supportive role on techniques and approaches and linking colleagues from the CRPs and Centers in partnerships with others outside the system was appropriate to building networks and long term capacity. Participants

supported the move towards collection of NRM research-related outcomes (building up a database of widely adopted NRM technology x country innovations) with some suggestions for sources of data, e.g., the earlier PMS exercise, but it was noted that a more active response from and engagement with CRPs was needed for this activity to be successful. CRP Directors were encouraged to provide relevant information, as per the SPIA chair's email in December.

In relation to the disciplinary composition of SPIA and its Secretariat and whether expertise in fields such as NRM, nutrition or gender is required, Gollin explained that whilst SPIA is actually currently composed of a small team of economists, SPIA can draw in other particular expertise as needed without making long-term commitments in staffing. Currently, SPIA is targeting evaluation of policy-oriented research impacts (of interest to IFPRI), or social science research impacts – and these are challenging. SPIA plans to move on to gender and institutions-related research impacts thereafter. Finally, a funder emphasized the importance of funders' understanding of the constraints to measuring impacts and suggested SPIA might want to scale back on the demand for evidence on impact, bringing in more language on outcomes. However, he expressed appreciation for the greater investment SIAC is making in panel data. The ISPC Chair thanked Gollin for his presentation and noted with satisfaction the positive developments under the SIAC program.

Agenda item 8. The Generation Challenge Program: Lessons learned

Jean-Marcel Ribaut presented an update on the Generation Challenge Program (GCP) focusing on its major achievements, findings from external review process, the transition strategy, and lessons learnt. GCP is a CGIAR Challenge Program hosted at CIMMYT which was launched in August 2003. It operated in two phases with a budget of US\$15-17 million annually: phase I in 2004-2008; and phase II in 2009-2013 with 2008 as a transition time between the two. GCP targeted drought-prone environments in SSA, S/SEA and Latin America, and 18 CGIAR mandate crops in Phase I and 9 in Phase II. During the project period, it built a network of over 180 partner institutions. In speaking about the major achievements of GCP, *Ribaut* noted that the EPMR Panel of 2008 had suggested that the community created by the program is one of its crucial assets. The program was built on partnerships with people working together because of their affinities, not funding, and there were in-kind contributions from most partners. There was also an evolution of roles and responsibilities with time: leaders became mentors, trainees became doers etc. and in 2013, more than half the principal investigators (PIs) were from developing countries.

The scientific outputs of GCP fall into two major categories – genetic resources and genomic resources, and this led to a number of publications in high impact journals such as Nature and PNAS. The programme's full product catalogue is available publicly (online). *Ribaut* emphasized that the GCP was not established to have a large impact for a given region or crop. It was designed to establish proof of concept that other institutions would build upon and scale up. One of the major lessons they learnt was that they could use service providers to do work instead of building their own infrastructure e.g. providing developing an integrated breeding platform online with resources for breeders to engage in routine breeding activities. A large component of the budget (20-25%) was earmarked for capacity building activities both traditional (e.g. postgraduate training programs, communities of practice etc.), and unique to GCP (e.g. building capacity of people along the delivery chain, technical support for infrastructure implementation etc.).

Ribaut then presented some highlights from the external review led by the CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) that is under factual revision. Over 90% of stakeholders agreed/strongly agreed that GCP had performed well on a range of indicators (relevance, partnership, products/outputs, efficiency etc.). When the CGIAR reform was being initiated and CRPs started up in 2010, GCP requested an extension of the transition timeline by a few years because they did not want to immediately split up the program into the respective CRPs. However, *Ribaut* explained that they remain committed to the plan at programme inception to end by 2013-14. Starting 2013, they have been working with crop program leaders to write position papers that consider three questions: what

'assets' will be completed by the end of GCP's lifetime in December 2014; what 'assets' can best continue as integral components of the CRPs or elsewhere; and what 'assets' may not fit within existing institutions or programmes and may require alternative implementation mechanisms for completion and perpetuation. A Closure Working Group that has been put in place will consider these issues and other operational/management aspects.

Finally, *Ribaut* summarized lessons from key learning areas including governance, scientific management, monitoring and evaluation, and linking upstream research with applied science. A major issue was that for nearly half of GCP's life until mid-2008, governance functioned poorly because the governance body was comprised of the direct beneficiaries of its own decisions. An independent body was subsequently set up to approve workplans and implementation while the stakeholders continued to define overall objectives and general direction. *Ribaut* cautioned that while this may work for the CRPs, they would need to consider its function, particularly from the accountability perspective. GCP also had to contend with inadequate research management capacity due to part time staff and a lack of M&E framework from the beginning. While having a standalone M&E component is advisable, it is also costly from an efficiency perspective. Initially, the GCP had a combination of competitive grants and commissioned projects, and transitioned to a model almost entirely reliant on commissioned projects in the interest of efficiency in achieving objectives despite the potential critiques of lack of transparency and lower value for money. This type of a combination model could be suitable for some research projects within a CRP. He also noted the importance of defining research product delivery pathways at project conception, and including clear identification of product users and impact assessment parameters.

In discussion, a Council member praised the efforts of the GCP, observing that it would have ranked highly if the ISPC's typical criteria for commentaries were to be applied. He suggested that the ISPC would continue to follow the continuation of the effort through the respective CRPs. The ISPC Chair raised a question about continuity in partnerships: if the representatives from 6 ARIs and 7 NARS had remained the same through the life of the program. *Ribaut* responded that they were a part of the program steering committee, and that the turnover of people did not affect the programme much since the engagement with the scientists at these institutions was more critical. There were also variations in the dynamics of partnerships based on what individual Centers were doing. A Council member observed that these lessons about partnerships and management are very important, and that one would need to be pragmatic about how these are chosen.

A few of the CRP leaders hoped that the lessons learnt from GCP could be picked up by the CRPs, and observed that the GCP went through a 5-year learning phase because there was a lot of political attention initially, following which they were able to 'get on' with the task at hand. It was also observed that CRP management is by consensus - because of the reporting structures of staff. This can take time but also become quite challenging to keep everyone on the team focused. It was noted that CRPs operate on 3-4 year budgets and may not always be able to change strategies when the one implemented does not deliver unlike GCP that was able to shift from competitive grants to commissioned grants to focus on delivery. Responding to a question on how to better orient themselves to clients in the context of Center/CRP's lack of a good track record on adoption, *Ribaut* responded that they involved primary users in the development of the products (breeders and some farmers in the target regions). However, since GCP defined its objectives as 'proof of concept', they did not focus much on adoption.

Ribaut stated that the success of the GCP was due to both what was done and how it was done. He spoke about the importance of agility in management, and the willingness to make difficult decisions including changing management staff if their expertise is no longer necessary or they are unwilling to adapt themselves. The Chair added that the ISPC evaluates both the how and what of a programme. In conclusion, while the discussants agreed that comparisons between the CRPs and the CPs is warranted, there is also some danger because of their difference in substance and these differences need to be understood.

Agenda item 9. Strategy and Trends

1. Report on the Metrics study by the Panel Chair, including discussion of implications for the CGIAR

Ken Giller, Chair of the panel of the strategic study on *Data, Metrics and Monitoring within the CGIAR*, presented a summary and recommendations of the report. The other panel members were Nancy Mock, a social scientist from Tulane University (USA), Simon Bell a systems research expert from the UK Open University, and Robert Hijmans a remote sensing expert from the University of California in Davis.

After introducing the rationale and background of the study, Giller discussed briefly the main uses of metrics and indicators, issues around the alignment with the SDGs, Foresight dimension, and role of ex-ante analysis, strategic targeting, and provided examples of exploratory studies. Discussing the main uses of metrics and indicators in the CGIAR, he highlighted their importance for impact assessment of the CGIAR as a whole, CRPs, Centres and staff. He questioned the possibility of whether indicators can be used for results-based allocation of resources and referred to a recent publication on performance management of research in the CGIAR², to highlight some of the key issues and the need for drawing lessons from the previous experience. Metrics and indicators are also used for monitoring research outcomes at country level, which may not be a key role of the CGIAR, whereas all CRPs will have their own sets of metrics and indicators for tracking progress toward their targets and IDOs.

In agreement with a previous presentation made by the director of the PIM CRP (Session 3), Giller suggested that the indicators for the SRF could be aligned with those for SDGs, using countries as the unit of measurement. Countries should be selected according to the density of CGIAR presence on the ground; they will define their specific indicators and set their own targets. Giller further suggested that country-level statistical services might do the measurement, with technical assistance from the CGIAR and other outside bodies. CGIAR and CRPs will report on contribution validated by countries, and will not seek attribution back to the CGIAR.

Giller, who is also a member of the SDSN Working Group 7, working on SDG targets and indicators for agriculture, discussed the possibilities of alignment of CGIAR indicators with those used for agricultural sections of SDGs. He questioned the feasibility of using some complex SDG indicators such as excessive nitrogen loss to environment, or the full chain nutrient use efficiency, which may be too difficult to measure. Commenting on the possible use of complex indices vs. simple indicators, he proposed that indices such as Women' Empowerment Index could be useful for communication but difficult to measure and hard to interpret, with all the assumptions made, particularly for weighting of metrics. He suggested that a dashboard or amoeba model could be easier and more transparent to use, although it needs scaling of all component indicators used. Giller recommended choosing a set of common simple metrics, with candidate indicators such as yield (output/ha, output/unit labour), farm size (ha per household, ha per person), Nitrogen use efficiency at field level (kg grain increase/kg N added), Dietary diversity, Tree Cover etc, and to investigate the feasibility of using more difficult metrics such as Capacity to innovate. He also described a set of guiding principles for choosing CGIAR metrics and indicators. If (more) complex indicators are chosen, all the input data must be standardized and made available, and calculations should be presented transparently. He also noted that issues of scaling (aggregation-disaggregation) need new research in the CGIAR.

The metrics panel stresses the need for common ontology and data collection standards and proposes a unified but decentralized system for the management of open data in the CGIAR. Giller highlighted the importance of ex-ante studies, which should be central to all research priority setting in the CGIAR.

² *Immonen, S., Cooksy, L.L., 2013. Using performance measurement to assess research: Lessons learned from the international agricultural research centres. Evaluation 20: 96–114.*

In discussion, ISPC members commented on the need to go beyond the immediate sense of urgency for developing CGIAR metrics and indicators, urging the Consortium to take the lead in thinking carefully about the inherent system complexities. There was also a question about the Panel's views and recommendations regarding the detailed process for establishing the CGIAR system's targets and metrics, and whether this should be a top-down process starting from the SLOs. In response, Giller noted that the panel cannot advise on the process details, as they were not part of the terms of reference. However, he also noted that establishing coherence is a pressing challenge, and developing a process should not be very difficult after a decision has been made.

In response to a question from *Wayne Powell*, the new CO Chief scientist on a possible focus on sustainable intensification to guide the development of metrics for sustainability, Giller agreed with the idea but also questioned the exact definition of sustainable intensification. Several participants and CRP directors discussed the possible implications of the report recommendation on the alignment with SDGs, possible metrics for gender research, and ex-ante analysis. *Shenggen Fan*, IFPRI DG commended Giller for his presentation and the recommendations made. He suggested that while the CGIAR should engage in the process of establishing SDG targets and metrics, by providing input and science, it should not necessarily adopt those metrics, which are mainly driven by a political process.

2. Reflection on the Biotechnology workshop

Council Member *Takuji Sasaki* reported the objectives of the Biotechnology study that had been commissioned by the ISPC in 2013. These had been to (i) assess the CGIAR research pipeline in biotechnology; (ii) analyze how CRPs and centers are positioning themselves strategically to achieve maximum synergy and efficiency- both internally and with partners; and, (iii) provide scenarios for future developments in biotechnology R&D, focusing on Issues such as IP, capacity and resources, regulatory frameworks, and political landscape that influences the choice of research pathways. The Biotechnology Panel had been chaired by Peter Langridge (University of Adelaide, Australia) who presented the study's findings at a workshop (on the 12th of March at IFPRI, just prior to the ISPC meeting). Other panel members were Jack Bobo (US Department of State) who also attended the workshop; Jonathan Jones (Sainsbury Lab., U.K.) and Takeshi Itoh (NIAS, Japan). The workshop discussed the recommendations of the study and implications for implementation of recommendations by the CGIAR. Forty participants representing CRPs, CGIAR partners and stakeholders took part. There were two Panel sessions, Webinar and Breakout group discussions with the aim to provide feedback on the study report and the implementation of the study's recommendations.

The major challenges identified by the review had included: a) Quality control systems to ensure that all outputs are of high standard and users can have full confidence in material, information and training programs; b) Data management systems must in place to support data capture, analysis and access; c) Modern technologies should be used to support the core capabilities – field phenotyping, genotyping and germplasm analysis [conventional breeding and the use of genetic modification (GM)]; d) Training and capacity building – Are Centers and CRPs enabling the most appropriate people to apply biotechnologies? e) Coordination of biotechnology across the CGIAR to build system wide critical mass; f) Integration of biotechnology projects into the overall objectives and delivery pipeline of the CGIAR to ensure useful outcomes in a reasonable timeframe; particularly significant for GM outputs. The Panel report lists nine major recommendations to address these issues.

Sasaki reported that there was general agreement on the focus and tone of panel recommendations arising from the workshop. An Advisory Board for GM is perhaps the single most important recommendation, but thought must be given as to how best to implement it. GM should be considered strategically - how it might contribute to good science, and the needs for conducive policy and effective regulation. The workshop drew the distinction between “GM” as a research tool and “GM” for deliverable products and there was need to build on previous success in the Centers, perhaps by working through more case studies.

New technology, particularly genome editing, should be considered for the generation of new traits in crops and livestock. The overall CGIAR strategy needs to consider the effective level of support services and to focus on the biotechnology applications that must be prioritized within cultivar development programs. Suggestions on the way forward might include the breeding platforms advocated by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The workshop participants encouraged the report and its ultimate implementation to look beyond just Centers and CRPs, at our partners and the global community. There needs to be a more forceful promotion of interaction with the private sector. Overall the CGIAR needs to develop a credible and transparent justification for investment – and to convey a strong message to the donor community.

Sasaki noted in conclusion that there would be a short workshop report, and that the Panel's main report would be edited based on the workshop comments and feedback. The ISPC would then develop a commentary on the Panel's report, which would be published together and shared with all CGIAR bodies.

3. Concepts for study of development corridors

Jeff Sayer (ISPC Council member) introduced the a concept note for a prospective, strategic study by the ISPC of development corridors – the spatial concentration of investments aimed at connecting economic agents with the goal of promoting growth – and, particularly, what they mean for agricultural research and development efforts. This builds on a prior ISPC study (2012/13) on farm size and urbanization, which asked a number of deep questions about who is going to be farming in 20 years-time and whether investments should focus on low-potential agricultural areas with the poorest people or in high-potential areas in order to facilitate the process of growth taking place there and pulling in people from the surrounding regions.

Klaus Deininger, lead economist at the World Bank, presented the rationale for development corridors in Africa in general and highlighted country examples for Ethiopia and Ghana. To date, success stories are limited but there is still not a lot of data to draw on. In Ethiopia, the government has been active in trying to secure foreign direct investment but there has not previously been a tracking system for monitoring how much land has been given out. Deininger presented findings from recent research showing the distribution of land allocated in Ethiopia and, perhaps surprisingly, the largest holding is 6,000 hectares, with the majority much smaller and concentrated along corridors. To date, maize is the only crop where large farms are getting better yields than small farms and these are in the more favourable areas so there could be a location effect. In Ghana, an outgrower scheme featuring Brazilian and Indian technology has integrated smallholders into the value chain. Here the farm-level picture is much healthier, and research findings show that the investment can have yield benefits while using less fertilizer. To date, there is no case of a mining-led *integrated* corridor development. The wider implementation of the corridor concept suggests a number of serious challenges to governments and private sector if the potential benefits to agricultural development are to be realized.

In discussion, Jeff Sayer noted that the ISPC did not see much mention of the corridors concept in the CRP proposals and that the ISPC would like to develop thinking about how these issues impact on the research agenda. Tom Randolph and Shenggen Fan both accepted the invitation to engage in conversation on this, with Fan asking about whether constraints imposed by country boundaries could be relaxed to allow sharing of seed, market access (i.e. trade) etc.. Deininger responded that certainly some of the institutional barriers can be overcome, noting the transfer of technology between Brazil and African countries which holds great promise. John McDermott pointed out that this study potentially implied a shift from focusing on poverty reduction and looking at agricultural potential. If that is the case, then the study could be framed around hypotheses with two large themes: 1) CGIAR is fixated on farmers, but rarely consider other participants in modern value chains; 2) A growth corridor vs. explicit poverty targeting are two quite different types of models – how do they compare on delivering benefits? Deininger noted that, even for Ethiopia, there is a big research agenda that agencies are only just starting to address by helping government institutions to use this empirical information better and act on it.

Karen Brooks voiced PIM support for this topic and the study and offered to work with the ISPC on it. Brooks highlighted how it is good to have evidence about the performance of “new farm starts” as much as the geographic configuration of them. Similarly, the associated demographic changes would be revealing, particularly the age distribution – are opportunities being created for young people through this process? Shantanu Mathur noted that there are positive externalities from embedding research in development projects which carry political and organizational influence so it can be a smart strategy for the CGIAR to work in this way. John McDermott returned to the theme of the farm size-urbanization workshop, asking if the issue is that people who are in the greatest poverty are in hinterland areas, then the prospects for helping them through research are limited. Should the focus be on the incremental gains in those hinterlands or in the more dynamic transformational changes in corridors? Proprietary research from private sector agents is likely to be dominant in corridors. He agreed with Sayer’s assessment that there is not much talk in the CRPs regarding the typologies of farms. It would be appropriate to explore the potential for transformational social change in hinterland areas – as the CGIAR is more comfortable talking about technological change than social change.

Agenda item 10. Mobilizing science

1. Concepts for partnership study

Peter Gardiner introduced the concept note with a short presentation on the study of research for development partnerships emerging for the CRP portfolio. He noted that the new CGIAR states its four System-level goals in the language of development outcomes, and in several cases the CRPs have made new partnership arrangements to help conduct the research or work towards these development outcomes. There are current CRP efforts to evaluate how partnerships are changing, an FO-commissioned study of delivery partnerships and mechanisms is underway and there is donor interest in understanding how to bridge from projects and programs to development outcomes. Concurrently, the CGIAR has gained experience in the formulation of innovation platforms, work on value chains involving chain actors including the private sector is starting and it is recognized that boundary organizations play a key role in enhancing CGIAR research.

He observed that there are key differences for the CGIAR in the establishment of effective partnerships moving towards each of the four SLOs and how the CGIAR can situate itself within public sector investments in developing country agriculture. For each of the SLOs, there are expected to be opportunities to bring CGIAR efforts into line (through scheduling, scaling, social support programs, etc.) with other global efforts towards regional development and the future SDGs, for instance.

He then outlined the suggested approach for the study, i.e. an SLO by SLO approach focused on some target IDOs. Background papers would be developed by SLO and perhaps one additional field (e.g. human health, mostly external to the CGIAR) as comparator. The papers would be discussed at a workshop that would bring together funders and agency representatives with other development experts in each field. The workshop would have three main outputs:

- a) sketch where other public sector agencies are investing in agriculture and related fields,
- b) draw lessons on types of partnership and partnership management that encourage success of research for development efforts (including best practices), and
- c) identify further possibilities for forming new partnerships, e.g. with development banks and other agencies which, through program alignment and scheduling could help scaling and achieving impacts on the SL-IDOs from CGIAR research in the future.

Overall such a study was welcomed by the participants, with several recommendations on improving the specificity. It was suggested that the advice on partnerships from the study be timed appropriately so that it was available before the 2nd call for CRPs. Two potential areas that were proposed for inclusion in the study included implementation of partnerships and partnership management, as well as innovations in partners (e.g. lessons from public health in bringing together numerous sectors using

case studies such as the decrease in child mortality). The need to procure funding for creating space for bridging activities between research and development (e.g. having global NGOs as full partners in CRPs) was highlighted, especially since there seems to be some appetite among development agencies for the same. Observers also advised that issues such as metrics (how to measure the outcome and quality of partnerships?), relationships between actors along the impact pathways, incentivizing trans-disciplinary research and building knowledge products (in addition to scientific publications) should be taken into consideration.

2. Follow-up on Science Forum 13 outputs

Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, provided a short update on the 2013 Science Forum on “Nutrition and health outcomes: targets for agricultural research” outputs and follow-up. She informed the meeting that over 200 agricultural, nutrition and health specialists attended the Science Forum, held in Bonn last September. The Forum was structured to be a mix of plenary and breakout sessions, with 5 simultaneous breakout sessions enabling greater opportunities for active participation of all delegates. Videos and slides from the various presentations together with the Forum summary report are available on the Science Forum 2013 (SF13) website while a distillation of the key messages will be published early this year as an ISPC Brief. Key findings of SF13 were relayed verbally to the Technical Meeting of the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) in November 2013. Additionally, an innovation of SF13 was the introduction of a session targeted at early-career scientists (ECS), and funds were made available for a competition between the 21 ECS who attended the Forum, to support exchange visits and create new partnerships. Eight such exchanges are being supported this year.

She further stated that a selection of papers from SF13 was expected to be published in a special edition of a peer reviewed journal. The proposal was turned down by Philosophical Transactions of Royal Society but other alternatives were being sought. A workshop is being planned to review the scientific conclusions from the Forum as well as examine, with key CRPs, the implications for future science and partnerships in delivering improved nutrition outcomes from agricultural research. Addis Ababa was initially proposed as a potential location for this workshop in May 2014 following the IFPRI 2020 resilience Conference, but this had currently been put on hold and a new date would be announced soon.

Gill presented a quick overview of the self-evaluation of the SF that the ISPC was conducting as a core mechanism for mobilizing science in terms of identifying new science needs and opportunities, forging new partnerships, and increasing the visibility of the CGIAR. Various tools were being used for this evaluation and the final report was expected to be ready before the next FC meeting in May.

She then indicated the need to decide on the subject matter for the next Forum to be held in 2015 mentioning that an option would be to look at SLO 1 on reducing rural poverty, and welcomed offers for hosting SF15. She added that the Forum might look at the science of how research in the topic was carried out rather than focussing on the impact of research on poverty alleviation.

There was consensus that poverty was a very broad topic and careful framing and articulation of the question was essential in tandem with adequate linkage with cutting edge scientists. Suggestions included value chains that could bring people out of poverty and research for development partnerships in the context of poverty. Gill concluded by stating that an e-mail would be sent out to center DGs and CRP leaders soliciting their advice in finalizing the topic for the upcoming Science Forum.

Agenda item 11. AOB

In the absence of further items, Maggie Gill thanked IFPRI and its staff through the DG for the support and hospitality offered to the ISPC in the planning and conduct of the meeting, including the Biotechnology workshop. She looked forward to working with new Council members and asked observers to keep an eye of the ISPC website where the timing and venue of the next ISPC meeting would be posted. She then closed the meeting.



Final Agenda

9th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council 12-14 March 2014

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

IFPRI Headquarters, Washington DC, United States
2033 K St, NW, Washington, DC 20006-1002

Tuesday 11th March

*Arrival of ISPC members
ISPC closed dinner*

Wednesday 12th March

Biotechnology Workshop, IFPRI Conference room 7AB

Thursday 13th March

ISPC Meeting, IFPRI Conference room 4AB

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 09:00 | 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Welcome and opening from ISPC Chairii. Welcome and opening from the IFPRI DG: Shenggen Fan |
| 09:15 | 2. IFPRI in 2014 (Shenggen Fan) |
| 10:00 | <i>Coffee break</i> |
| 10:30
Brooks) | 3. CRP 2: Activities and deliverables (CRP2 Leader Karen |

- 11:30
for phase 2
- 4. Mapping CRP sites - prioritization of CGIAR activities**
(Melanie Bacou)
- 12:30
Lunch hosted by IFPRI
- 14:00
- 5. CGIAR update**
- i. ISPC Chair
 - ii. Consortium CEO (Frank Rijsberman)
 - iii. Fund Office Ex. Secretary (Jonathan Wadsworth)
 - iv. Secretary of the MTR Panel (Warren Evans)
 - v. IEA Representative (Sirkka Immonen)
- 15:45
Discussion
- 16:15
Coffee/tea
- 17:15
- 6. Independent Program Review**
Preparing the 2nd phase CRP review – extension proposal in
2014
- 18:00
End of meeting
- 19:00
attend.
- Meeting dinner hosted by the ISPC: all participants welcome to
(Restaurant “District Commons”)

Friday 14th March

- 09:00
- 7. SIAC - Implementing the 2014 workplan**
(SPIA Chair, Doug Gollin, via Skype)
- 10:30
Coffee break
- 11:00
- 8. The Generation Challenge Program: Lessons learned**
(Jean-Marcel Ribaut)
- 12:30
Lunch
- 14:00
- 9. Strategy and Trends**
- i. Metrics Report (Panel Chair, Ken Giller)
- including discussion of implications for the CGIAR
 - ii. Reflection on Biotechnology w/shop (Takuji Sasaki)
 - iii. Concepts for study of development corridors
(Jeff Sayer and Klaus Deininger, World Bank)
- 15:45
Coffee/tea

- 16:00 **10. Mobilizing science** (Maggie Gill)
- i. Concepts for partnership study
 - ii. Follow-up on Science Forum 13 outputs
- 17:00 **11. AOB**
- 17:30 Close of Open meeting



Independent Science
and Partnership
Council

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ISPC 9th Meeting

IFPRI, Washington DC, USA
13th - 14th March 2014

Independent Science and Partnership Council of the CGIAR (ISPC)

1. Margaret Gill

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

2. Jeff 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

3. 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

4. Douglas Gollin (*intervention by Go2Meeting*)

Chair, SPIA
Department of International Development
Queen Elizabeth House
3 Mansfield Road
Oxford OX1 3TB
United Kingdom
Tel. +44 (0)1865 281 832
Email: Douglas.Gollin@williams.edu

5. Takuji Sasaki

Takuji Sasaki, Ph.D.
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

OBSERVERS / PARTICIPANTS

6. Frank Rijsberman

CGIAR Consortium CEO
CGIAR Consortium Office
c/o AGROPOLIS INTERNATIONAL
Avenue Agropolis
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5
Tel. +33 4 670 47 575
Email: f.rijsberman@cgiar.org

7. Jonathan Wadsworth

CGIAR Fund Office – Executive Secretary
The World Bank, MSN P6-601
1818 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel. +1 202 473 8951
Fax. +1 202 473 8110
Email: j.wadsworth@cgiar.org

8. Maxine Garvey

CGIAR Fund Office – Executive Secretary
The World Bank, MSN P6-601
1818 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel. +1 202 473 8951
Email: mgarvey1@worldbank.org

9. Marlene Diekmann

GIZ Germany
Godesberger Allee 119
53175 Bonn, Germany
Tel. +49 228 24 934 212
Fax. +49 228 24 934 215
Email: marlene.diekmann@giz.de

- 10. Aden A. Aw-Hassan**
Director
Social, Economics and Policy Research Program (SEPRP)
International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
(ICARDA)
Abdoun Al-Shamalie - Khalid Abu Dalbough Str.
Amman 11181, Jordan
Tel. 962-6-5903120-ext 135
Mob: 962-799185488
Email: a.aw-hassan@cgiar.org
- 11. Sirkka Immonen**
Senior Evaluation Officer, IEA
c/o FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
Tel. +39 06 570 54762
Email: sirkka.immonen@fao.org
- 12. Eric Witte**
USAID
BFS/ARP RRB 4.10-090
Washington, DC
USA 20523
Tel. +1 202 712 1906
Email: ewitte@usaid.gov
- 13. Shoba Sivasankar**
Director, CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Cereals
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICRISAT-IN
Patancheru 502324
Andhra Pradesh, India
Tel. +91 40 30713071
Fax. +91 40 30713074
Email: s.sivasankar@cgiar.org
- 14. Noel Ellis**
Director, CGIAR Research Program Grain Legumes
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
ICRISAT-IN
1 Patancheru 502324
Andhra Pradesh, India
Tel. +91 40 30713071
Fax. +91 40 30713074
Email: n.ellis@cgiar.org
- 15. Rajeev Varshney**
Director
Center of Excellence in Genomics (CEG)

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
(ICRISAT)

Patancheru 502324

Andhra Pradesh, India

Tel. +91 40 3071 3305

Fax. +91 40 30713074

Email: r.k.varshney@cgiar.org

16. Andrew Noble

Program Director – WLE

IWMI

P. O. Box 2075, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

127, Sunil Mawatha, Pelawatte, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka

Telephone: +94-11 2880000

Fax: +94-11 2786854

Email: a.noble@cgiar.org

17. Yusuf Abubakar

Executive Secretary

Agricultural Research Council of Nigeria (ARCN)

Fund Council Member

Address: Mabushi, Abuja

Tel. +234 8034 51 8811

Email: byabubakarr@yahoo.com

18. John McDermott

Director, A4NH-IFPRI

International Food Policy Research Institute

2033 K St, NW

Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA

Phone +1 202-862-5600

Fax +1 202-467-4439

Email: j.mcdermott@cgiar.org

19. Ylva Hillbur

Deputy Director General for Research

International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

PMB 5320 Oyo Road

Idaban, Nigeria

Tel. +1 201 633 6094 or + 234 2 7517472 ext 2335

Email: y.hillbur@cgiar.org

20. Graham Thiele

Director

CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB)

Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina

Apartado Postal 1558, Lima, Peru

Email: g.thiele@cgiar.org

- 21. Jean-Marcel Ribaut**
Director
Generation Challenge Program c/o CIMMYT
Carretera Mexico Veracruz Km. 45
El Batán, Texcoco, México CP 56237
MEXICO
Work Phone: +52 55 5804-2004 ext. 1311
Email: j.ribaut@cgiar.org
- 22. Wayne Powell**
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
- 23. Margaret Kroma**
Assistant Director General, Partnerships & Impact
World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
PO Box 30677, Nairobi, 00100, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7224000
Email: m.kroma@cgiar.org
- 24. Anja Gassner**
Assistant Director General, Partnerships & Impact
World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
PO Box 30677, Nairobi, 00100, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7224000
Email: a.gassner@cgiar.org
- 25. Chikelu Mba**
Agricultural Officer – AGPM (FAO)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome Italy
Tel. +39 570 56265
Email: chikelu.mba@fao.org
- 26. Shenggen Fan**
Director General – IFPRI
2033 K St, NW
Washington DC 20006-1002
USA
Tel. +1 202 862 5600
Email: s.fan@cgiar.org

- 27. Stacy Roberts**
Secretary Board of Trustees and Head of Donor Relations
IFPRI
2033 K St, NW
Washington DC 20006-1002
USA
Tel. +1 202 862 5600
Email: s.roberts@cgiar.org
- 28. Karen Brooks**
Director
CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets
2033 K St, NW
Washington DC 20006-1002
USA
Tel. +1 202 862 5600
Email: k.brooks@cgiar.org
- 29. Rajul Pandya-Lorch**
Head 2020 Vision Initiative and Chief of Staff
IFPRI
Email: r.pandya@cgiar.org
- 30. Shashidur Rashid**
Senior Research Fellow
IFPRI
Email: s.rashid@cgiar.org
- 31. Teunis van Rheenen**
Senior Research Fellow
IFPRI
Email: t.vanrheenen@cgiar.org
- 32. Xiaobo Zhang**
Senior Research Fellow
IFPRI
Email: x.zhang@cgiar.org
- 33. Xinshen Diao**
Deputy Division Director-DSG
IFPRI
Email: x.diao@cgiar.org
- 34. Gwendolyn Stansbury**
Division Director-CKM
IFPRI
Email: g.stansbury@cgiar.org
- 35. David Governey**
Division Director-F&A
IFPRI

Email: d.governey@cgiar.org

- 36. Evgeniya Anisimova**
Communications Specialist
IFPRI
Email: e.anisimova@cgiar.org
- 37. Maria Theresa Tenorio**
Senior Admin Coordinator/Contract & Grants Administrator
IFPRI
Email: m.t.tenorio@cgiar.org
- 38. Pascale Sabbagh**
Senior Program Manager
IFPRI
Email: p.sabbagh@cgiar.org
- 39. Suresh Babu**
Senior Research Fellow
IFPRI
Email: s.babu@cgiar.org
- 40. Jawoo Koo**
Research Fellow
IFPRI
Email: j.koo@cgiar.org
- 41. Ken Giller**
Professor
Department of Plant Sciences
Wageningen University
Droevendaalsesteeg 4, 6708 PB
Wageningen, Netherlands
Tel. +31 (0) 317 480100
Email: ken.giller@wur.nl
- 42. Thomas Randolph**
Director
CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
30709 Naivasha Rd, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. +254 20 3747554
Email: t.randolph@cgiar.org
- 43. Maya Rajasekharan**
Senior Program Coordinator
International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira
Apartado Aéreo 6713

Cali, Colombia
Tel. +57 2 4450000
Email: m.rajasekharan@cgiar.org

- 44. Daniel Suryadarma**
Senior scientist
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
P.O. Box 0113 BOCBD
Bogor 16000
Indonesia
Tel. +62-251-8622622
Email: d.suryadarma@cgiar.org
- 45. Greg Traxler**
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
PO Box 6176
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
USA
Tel. (202) 662-8130
Email: greg.traxler@gatesfoundation.org
- 46. Klaus Deininger**
Lead Economist
Development Research Group
World Bank
1818 H Street
NW Washington, DC 20433
USA
Tel. +1 202 473 0430
Email: kdeininger@worldbank.org
- 47. Pammi Sachdeva**
Independent Management Consulting Professional
Washington D.C. Metro Area
Email: pssachdeva@aol.com
- 48. Sophia van der Bijl**
M&E Advisor
USAID Bureau for Food Security
1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC
20004, United States
Tel. +1 202-647-1099
Email: svanderbijl@usaid.gov
- 49. Ahmed Kablan**
International Public Health and Nutrition Adviser
USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW

Washington, DC
20004, United States
Tel. +1 202-647-1099
Email: akablan@usaid.gov

50. Shantanu Mathur

Director
Quality Assurance and Grants Unit
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Via Paolo di Dono, 44
00142 Rome, Italy
Tel. +39-0654591
Email: s.mathur@ifad.org

ISPC SECRETARIAT

51. Peter Gardiner

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

52. Timothy Kelley

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

53. Sirkka Immonen

Senior Officer
c/o FAO
Senior Officer
Tel. +39 570 54861
Email: sirkka.immonen@fao.org

54. Rachid Serraj

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

55. James Stevenson

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

- 56. Preetmoninder Lidder**
Research and Communication Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 56208
Email: preetmoninder.lidder@fao.org
- 57. Lakshmi Krishnan**
Research Officer
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 570 51 (general number)
Email: lakshmi.krishnan@fao.org
- 58. Muriel Pougheon**
Program Assistant
c/o FAO
Tel. + 39 06 570 52103
Email: muriel.pougheon@fao.org
- 59. M^a Victoria Alemany Martín**
Meeting Coordinator
c/o FAO
Tel. +39 06 570 53645
Email: victoria.alemany@fao.org