

(14th October 2013)

**Work Plan and Budget (2014)**  
of the **CGIAR's Independent Science & Partnership Council (ISPC)**

***Executive Summary***

The ISPC presents its WorkPlan and Budget for 2014 for consideration of the Fund Council.

The ISPC aims to contribute advice which will enhance the relevance and quality of science, as well as the impact and value for money of the CGIAR's research for development efforts. Major elements in 2014 include an expanded effort in strengthening impact assessment in the CGIAR through direction and management of the SIAC project; a new study under Strategy and Trends of the emerging trend towards "development corridors" and what this means for CGIAR research in Africa; and a new study under Mobilizing science of public sector investments and potential partnerships in support of the CGIAR's research for development agenda. Across all its activities, the ISPC will continue to enhance communication of its study findings and evidence-based assessments increasingly through workshops with the CRPs and external stakeholders (e.g. in addressing poverty impacts on the basis of SPIA studies, for research on nutrition and health building on the outcomes of a successful Science Forum in 2013 etc.).

The ISPC has played a major role in review of CRP proposals and is aware that a 2<sup>nd</sup> call for revised CRP proposals is under consideration, although the time frame is yet to be decided. The ISPC therefore presents its plans for contributing to CRP review in 2014/2015 noting that simultaneous review and Commentary preparation will require large amounts of ISPC time. The ISPC remains flexible, however, and is prepared to adjust or postpone some activities of the Workplan described (e.g. the study of the private sector interface, the second poverty workshop) to allow focus on the review function when the timetable is decided.

Turnover in Chair and Council membership and at the Secretariat is anticipated 2013/2014 but the overall composition of the Council will be maintained, with some strengthening of SPIA and SIAC program management.

The ISPC budget request for 2014 is USD 3.731 million of which USD 2.407 million is requested from CGIAR Funds (system costs).

## ***The Role of the ISPC***

In the reformed CGIAR, the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC)'s overarching purpose is *“to provide independent advice and expertise to the funders of the CGIAR through services to the Fund Council and the Funders Forum. It also serves as an intellectual bridge between the funders and the Consortium of CGIAR Centers.”*<sup>1</sup> Strategic foresight and mobilizing science form a core part of its agenda, in addition to periodic *ex ante* program review and impact assessment undertaken through the activities of SPIA. The monitoring and evaluation of CGIAR research programs (the CRPs) is undertaken by the newly created Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA).

Thus the four major areas of activity for the ISPC are: Strategy and Trends; Independent Program Review; Mobilizing Science and Strategic Partnerships; and Independent Impact Assessment. This WorkPlan is organized around activities planned against these areas in 2014. For a progress report on ISPC activities carried out in 2012/2013, see Annex B.

## ***The ISPC in 2013/2014***

The ISPC is constituted as a Council of a Chair and five members<sup>2</sup> with the Chair of SPIA being an active member of the Council (making 7 experts in total) and involved in its debates and decision-making. One member of the inaugural Council stepped down at the end of 2012 and Dr Takuji Sasaki of Japan was appointed to Council in mid-2013. The Council will undergo further turnover for 2014 with a change of the Chair and one member; both stepping down at their request because of time conflicts and workload. Further turnover is foreseen for 2014/15. The process for recruitment of a new Chair and Member for 2014 is currently underway managed by the Fund Office.

## **Strategy and Trends**

In the Foundation documents of the new CGIAR the ISPC is tasked specifically to:

“Provide the Fund Council and the Funders Forum with foresight advice on trends and emerging issues, as well as potential strategies of addressing them related to the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework. In undertaking this role the ISPC will act as commissioner and coordinator of any required foresight studies, drawing on expertise within the Consortium and beyond, as appropriate, to undertake them.”

The ISPC has interpreted this role as primarily being a provider of analyses of current and emerging issues of importance to CGIAR research. Thus the ISPC's role in foresight is to exercise critical thinking concerning future developments relevant to agriculture and agricultural research, and to synthesize and interpret the results of the studies in order to better inform the decision making process within the new CGIAR. Findings from think-tanks active in this area and other foresight initiatives (that may conduct foresight research involving scenario analysis and forecasting through modeling and other methods) are monitored by ISPC in developing its activities. By doing so the ISPC aims at providing expert analysis to continuously inform CGIAR policy, longer-term strategic planning, and its own agenda.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cgiarfund.org/ISPC>

<sup>2</sup> This is one more than originally foreseen in the CGIAR foundation documents, but allowance was made initially for a linking member of the earlier interim ISPC/SC and this number (ISPC Chair plus five members plus the Chair of SPIA) has proved a minimum number to execute the ISPC work load in the period 2011-13.

To support this role in its Work Plan & Budget, the ISPC puts emphasis on studying “*future trends likely to affect CGIAR planning with specific relevance to the CGIAR’s ability to deliver on the target System Level Outcomes (SLOs) as well as acting as an honest broker for more immediate strategic issues in science.*”<sup>3</sup>

The added value that the ISPC can provide is to attract the best available expertise worldwide to provide balanced assessment specific to the CGIAR’s context regarding what is known or predicted about future trends. The ISPC’s comparative advantage to contribute to foresight analysis for the CGIAR comes from:

- convening power allowing the ISPC to tap into a broad range of geographies, disciplines and research suppliers
- intellectual and financial independence, deriving from the fact that members have no particular academic or financial interest in what is funded
- impartial status, e.g. compared to the political status of the donors, members of the ISPC are selected as individuals, independent of any allegiance to their employers
- interdisciplinary membership compared to the narrower disciplinary focus of individual Centers or think tanks
- permanent Secretariat that adds to the interdisciplinary mix of the Council and retains institutional memory
- proximity to and familiarity with the CGIAR, compared to global foresight think tanks
- “peer review” function that is needed in the reformed CGIAR to involve independent peer review of both the foresight work and the strategic cross-cutting initiative within the CRPs and “peer overview” of the CGIAR portfolio

The purpose of ISPC strategic studies and trend analyses is to inform the CGIAR on new trends and emerging issues in agricultural science and in the wider development environment (including types of, and approaches to, partnership) and to present opportunities that could inform prioritization of research and thus ought to be considered in adjusting the CGIAR’s research agenda. Results from these studies can help steer the current CRPs towards unexplored questions and new partnerships, or identify areas where new research programs or program components would be needed. Such study results feed into periodic revisions of the SRF and should also inform adjustment of current CRPs that have funding cycles of about 3-4 years.

Three activities are proposed under Strategy and Trends in 2014 and described below. Because of the uncertainty of the timing of the requirements for the ISPC in its CRP Review function, if time is limiting the ISPC will prioritise studies 1 and 2, as well as 6 and 7 under Mobilising Science.

### **1. A Strategic study of biotechnology in the CGIAR**

A study is underway (commenced 2013) by an expert panel commissioned by the ISPC and with contacts to CRPs and Center focal points to: i) assess the biotechnology research pipeline in the CGIAR and its impact on research successes and failures; ii) analyze how the CRPs should position themselves strategically in relation to internal and external partnerships to achieve maximum synergy and efficiency in biotechnology research, and, iii)

---

3

[http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/Workplan\\_and\\_Budget/ISPC\\_WPB\\_2013.pdf](http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/fileadmin/templates/ispc/documents/Workplan_and_Budget/ISPC_WPB_2013.pdf)

to provide scenarios regarding near- and mid-term developments that will influence the investment choices of the CGIAR. A workshop to discuss the Panel's report and determine the most effective investment options, including perspectives on biotechnology research priorities, will be held in the first quarter of 2014 with input from donors. The objectives are to derive guidance for the Consortium and Fund Council on funding, focus and strategies to gain synergy from CRP actions and partnerships to benefit breeding and germplasm, conservation and research.

[USD 80,000 is allotted for this consultative workshop on the biotechnology expert panel's findings.]

## **2. Study of the effects of Development Corridors for CGIAR research**

*Context:* Designated "growth corridors" are increasingly determining settlement patterns and rural land use in Africa and to a lesser extent in other regions. These government-supported corridors are penetrating into areas where agriculture has been constrained by lack of access to markets. Growth corridors could unleash a major expansion of arable crops in the Guinea and Miombo savannahs, tropical tree crops in Congo Basin rainforests, and irrigated agriculture on the floodplains of several African river systems. Rapidly growing African cities are largely dependent on imported food, but growth corridors linking them to hinterland areas could favour shifts to African-sourced foods.

The growth corridor phenomenon builds on the recent ISPC study on farm size and urbanisation. This study pointed out that development options for poor farmers in "hinterland" areas are much more limited than those in accessible areas - so rural-urban migration and farm size increases are predicted to have significant impacts on agriculture in accessible areas. Growth corridors are going to impact on what is hinterland and what is accessible.

Critics point out that weakness in governance may allow outside investors to make land grabs along growth corridors and further marginalise poor smallholders. New pressures on environmentally sensitive areas may emerge. They advocate that policy changes are needed to avoid negative impacts of this major new development trend and to exploit the potential for poverty alleviation and food-security benefits.

*Implications for the CGIAR research portfolio:* The growth corridor phenomenon drives the conclusions of the farm size and urbanisation study a stage further. Smallholder farmers are risk averse and often reject possible advances in technology favouring immediate rather than long-term concerns. Yet when conditions warrant it, farmers will show remarkable abilities and willingness to innovate – rapid, transformative innovation is a feature of peri-urban situations but also of agriculture along new transport infrastructure. The present dominant paradigm in CGIAR's theories of change remains that of small, incremental changes in existing farming systems – some new seeds for the 400 million smallholders in Africa, etc. We are still investing heavily in delivery systems that will at best deliver incremental change. Development corridors hold the prospect of transformative change on a large scale.

The intent of the ISPC in conducting a study of this emerging development trend will be to review the (non-advocacy) literature to examine innovation and the routes to equitable welfare outcomes through attaching research to existing or planned growth corridor developments in a small number of contrasting countries relevant to the CGIAR. If growth corridors really do eliminate many of the barriers to innovation then the role of the CGIAR

might be quite different – we may wish to redress the balance and return to the paradigm of keeping the shelf well stocked with innovations in the knowledge that users will find them. The study should also determine whether the CGIAR is positioned or able to do research for the people left in those “hinterlands” and what can be predicted about their likely livelihood strategies. The results of the study will be of assistance to the CGIAR consortium and CRPs to plan place-based research in the face of emerging trends towards growth corridor development.

[USD 100,000 is allocated to this study for desk-based analysis including contacts with other groups analysing this phenomenon, consultations in 2-3 country examples and development of options for research both within growth corridors and adjacent hinterland areas.]

### ***3. The CGIAR interface with the private sector, present and future***

As part of the rationale advanced in the foreword to this section, the ISPC has used its meetings to present and discuss new strategic areas of potential importance to the CGIAR with observers. The study of development corridors was roundly supported through this process. To broaden input into the choices of such studies the ISPC plans to develop more preparatory material to share with CGIAR stakeholders through a small number of pilot studies, trends analyses or concept note development to explore strategic issues of potential importance to the CGIAR. The first approach will be to explore as a desk study the CGIAR interface with the private sector as it exists currently and with a view to areas that may be improved by shifts in CGIAR science, organization or stance.

*Context:* Given the pace of the research process and despite the resurgence of investment in agriculture, research will not be able to deliver the science soon enough to support growth in productivity needed immediately, especially in Africa. Partnerships with global scientific organizations will have to be central to the science agenda for African agriculture in order to draw more fully on the strengths of science elsewhere. Some of these partners are the BRIC countries and agencies referred to in study 7 below. However, private firms are interested in commercial opportunities in Africa but these are presently hard to structure without further reforms in the innovation environment, in order to attract substantial investments in key value chains relevant for agricultural systems in Africa or elsewhere. This would involve the revision of intellectual property rights, including, as appropriate, plant variety protection laws, land use and tenure reforms, infrastructure modernization, among other important issues. Thus the question is not whether the direction for development will be public sector *or* private sector, but how efforts can be moulded in partnerships for the overall delivery of public goods or to avoid competition in research strategies which undermine opportunities for the poor. Agricultural systems are becoming very complex, even in less developed countries, creating an environment where the participation of private agents is indispensable. The challenge is then to provide ways and means for the CGIAR to engage more effectively in interactions with the private sector (in all its forms). The majority of interactions with the private sector to date have been in genetic technologies, cereal plant hybrids, vaccines, information sharing and the exploration of IP and contracts. Very little has been done on natural resource management or other types of analysis. This suggests that there will have to be an examination of what is feasible and then a selection or a focussing of CGIAR research (on technologies and institutions) within a framework of overall development assistance and the creation of opportunity. The ISPC sees value in an analysis of the articulation of the several interfaces between public and private sectors - including offers for seed-based technology work from private sector partners, the call for greater private sector inputs in veterinary health

and feeds, the New Alliance Partner Forum, work on ICTs and IP, incorporating CGIAR nutrition outputs into feasible distribution networks etc. - and for the outcomes of the study to help structure CGIAR/PS support to development, building into strategic scenarios and game plans.

[The exploratory analysis will be conducted as a desk study with USD 30,000 allocated for a study leader and private sector consultations.]

### **Independent Program Review**

The ISPC plays an important role in providing advice to the Fund Council on the scientific credibility and investment worthiness of program proposals, as well as aspects of CGIAR policy. CGIAR is considering a 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 cycles.

The ISPC believes that a call for revised CRP proposals which are reviewed in a coordinated fashion will be of strategic value and will strengthen the CGIAR research portfolio. With some CRPs nearing the end of the initial tranche of funding, there has been refinement in thinking and some experience across the system in structuring research towards development goals, particularly through the work on identifying IDOs. The 2<sup>nd</sup> call gives an opportunity to be more selective and demanding of coherence and focus (prioritization within CRPs). It gives the CGIAR the opportunity to screen components of CRPs and select the strongest proposals, supported by peer review of the science and relevance of the components to be managed by the ISPC. The 2<sup>nd</sup> call is thus important both for individual CRPs (as before) but also for gaining a more comprehensive view of the implementation of overall strategy and the balance of effort of the research portfolio.

Timing and sequence: The Consortium has advanced a number of possible time frames for the development and review of 2<sup>nd</sup> phase proposals which have in common a review process to be conducted by the ISPC, firstly of pre-proposals and then of full proposals. One option seeks to complete the entire selection process in approximately 18 months by the end of 2015. The ISPC concurs, believing that taking earlier opportunities to hasten change and alignment of strategic elements of the CGIAR portfolio will be more effective than a delay and entrenchment.

#### ***4. Assistance to the Consortium for future CRP development: guidelines and metrics***

Thus the ISPC is preparing to carry out a new round of reviews of CRPs which would entail review of pre-proposals in the last quarter of 2014 and full proposals for CRPs in the second half of 2015 for decision making by the FC in late 2015. Whilst simultaneous review of short pre-proposals may be feasible, the review of full proposals, including the preparation and discussion of many commentaries simultaneously, poses the largest challenge for the ISPC as the Council is not composed of full time Members. Some staggering of this part of the review process (e.g. review of related batches of CRPs) may be required. As per previous practice, the ISPC will assemble a pool of experts to provide external peer review of both stages of the process. A smaller number of reviewers, potentially looking across several pre-proposals, will be used at the first stage. Teams of up to 5 expert reviewers will be sought for the review of full proposals with their perspectives serving as a basis for the development of commentaries by the ISPC. When draft review materials have been prepared, the ISPC will sit as a proposal review Board which will require additional face to face meetings. The added

value from an ISPC review of all pre-proposals and full proposals is considered to be the ability to provide a perspective on the overall portfolio and this will occasion an additional commentary by the ISPC in late 2015.

[According to the time schedule described, the ISPC has allotted USD 50,000 in this budget for pre-proposal review in 2014, with Council members and Secretariat time preferentially weighted to this activity in the second half of the year. If the process proceeds to full proposal review in 2015, around USD200,000 will be required additionally for an expert pool of peer reviewers for review of CRP full proposals (not entered in this budget) and the Council expects to commit a major proportion of its time to the review function in 2015].

However, in the lead up, the ISPC will offer its assistance to the Consortium CEO and Office in development of criteria and guidelines for the preparation of strategic proposals and their effective review. It will also consider how the outcomes of the metrics study can be incorporated into overall guidance to the CGIAR and the infrastructure and monitoring tasks that are raised by the recommendations of that study. Assistance to the Consortium in these areas will be provided through existing staff resources.

**5. Means to address poverty in theory and practice: pathways to SLO1** (follow up workshop in conjunction with SIAC objective 4)

The earlier studies of the ISPC/SPIA have suggested that, contrary to expectation, the real poverty alleviating effects of CGIAR research have been difficult to capture. Addressing SLO1, given the heterogeneity of contexts of the poor and the variable capacity of agricultural research alone to provide opportunities for direct assistance to the poor (noted in the farm size and urbanization study and the recent SLO-linkages paper) means that a further realistic evaluation of poverty is called for by the CGIAR. The ISPC synthesis of the farm size study suggested that to get effects at scale, target groups in upwardly mobile or progressive areas in terms of infrastructure and services should be targeted by CGIAR research. However, this leaves hinterlands and their populations excluded. It may be that approaching these groups, contrary to current rhetoric, is beyond the means of the CGIAR - but others assert that the CGIAR has much to offer in averting risk and securing (the often natural resource-based) assets of these poor groups, albeit in contextualized and more local settings. It is important to understand whether this dual narrative is tenable by the CGIAR and the extent to which scale issues should be the deciding factor on the pathways through which the CGIAR will attempt to address SLO1. A workshop reviewing past evidence (SPIA commissioned studies) of poverty alleviation impacts by the CGIAR is already planned by SIAC in the first quarter of 2014. The ISPC suggests that the findings of this review should inform a cross-CRP perspective with external experts which could be convened subsequently (e.g. second or third quarter of 2014). The intent would be to rigorously evaluate time frames and scale of beneficiaries of pro-poor research encompassed by the current portfolio of CGIAR research. The ISPC believes that this will contribute towards understanding the value of research for development in less favored or hinterland areas. The perspectives from such an expert workshop could be a timely input into the further strategic development of the portfolio in a year's time. It would also contribute to understanding whether the state of poverty and research towards SLO1 would make an appropriate potential topic for detailed consideration by the CGIAR at a future Science Forum.

[USD 55,000 is requested to commission papers and experts, and convene a representative meeting of CRPs and including country managers of poverty alleviation programs from target nations and agencies.]

## **Mobilizing Science**

The ISPC has utilized the holding of a biennial Science Forum to catalyze discussion and to convene scientific groups external to the CGIAR around important issues. The research for development focus of the transformed CGIAR has increased the emphasis on System-level outcomes and the potential range of partnerships required by the CGIAR to have impacts on human welfare and environmental goals at scale. A successful meeting entitled *Nutrition and health outcomes: targets for agricultural research* has just been completed, co-hosted with BMZ of Germany in Bonn (September, 2013). Knowledge of partners in new scientific communities is a key benefit of such meetings and a high-level contribution from the nutrition community, including agency and NGO practitioners was represented. However, studies of the efficacy of partnerships have been undertaken less often by the ISPC, or more usually as an intrinsic component of other scientific reviews.

### ***6. Dissemination of the Science Forum outcomes for enhancing nutrition outcomes from agricultural research***

For each of the Science Fora, the ISPC has published immediate post-conference summaries and briefs of some of the key lessons (and this is in progress for the most recently completed Science Forum in September 2013), but also developed more detailed special issues of journal publications using key papers which can inform CGIAR research and the specialist field at large. The publication in refereed journals inevitably takes time.

As well as these means of publication, key findings of Science Forum 2013, on how agricultural research can best meet human nutrition and health outcomes, will be relayed verbally to the Technical Meeting of the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) in November 2013. However, to capitalize on the digested but still current scientific outputs, and new partner exposure through the Forum, the ISPC plans to hold a workshop in mid-2014 to review the scientific conclusions from the Forum and ensure high quality and rapid completion of a special scientific publication. As importantly, it will use 1-2 days of the workshop to examine, with key CRPs, the implications for future science and partnerships in delivering improved nutrition outcomes from agricultural research.

[USD 30,000 has been budgeted for the science-review workshop and distilling implications for research and partnerships towards SLO3.]

### ***7. Study of research for development partnerships emerging for the CRP portfolio***

The ISPC has developed three white papers (published in 2012/13) encouraging the targeting of intermediate development outcomes (IDOs) by CGIAR research, developing theories of change for pathways towards those IDOs and addressing the issues of how research towards the different higher, system-level outcomes (SLOs) may be synergistic or require discrete avenues for either research or delivery. The CRPs are actively engaged in developing CRP-specific and common IDOs and in several cases have made new partnership arrangements to help conduct the research or work towards development outcomes. The question that the ISPC has identified is whether there are key differences for the CGIAR in the establishment of partnerships moving towards each of the four SLOs and how the CGIAR can situate itself within public sector investments in developing country



agriculture. There are expected to be opportunities to bring CGIAR efforts into line (through scheduling, scaling, social support programs, etc.) with other global efforts towards the future SDGs, for instance. This study combines two areas from the ISPC's priority list of topics (namely, partners for impact and the role of boundary organizations in enhancing CGIAR research). The study will develop papers on the pathways to impact for the four SLOs (poverty alleviation, food security, human nutrition and the environment supporting agricultural production) and potentially other fields external to the CGIAR like human health, to help understand the differences and array of partnerships that have enhanced, or promise to enhance, impacts in these fields. The papers will be discussed at a workshop which brings together key boundary partners (UN agencies, public health organisations /development banks/farmer organisations/environmental organisations) as well as representatives of emerging economies who offer different routes to partnerships and delivery. The outputs of the workshop are intended to 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, and to c) further possibilities for forming new partnerships, e.g. with development banks and other agencies which, through program alignment could help scaling and achieving impacts on the SL-DOs from CGIAR research in the future. Looking towards further steps for the strategic development of the CRPs, the ISPC judges this an important juncture to assist the examination of mobilizing development partnerships for the delivery of CGIAR science.

[The cost of commissioning five background papers and a workshop are budgeted at USD 75,000.]

## **Impact Assessment**

The system-level impact assessment activities of the ISPC are carried out by its Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA). Support for SPIA staffing is made through the ISPC budget (Council and Secretariat, see Table 2). SPIA's activities and additional consultants etc. have traditionally been funded under the ISPC's budget for the Council's activities on an annual basis. For the period 2013-2015, CGIAR funders have committed substantial additional funding for a Program to Strengthen Impact Assessment in the CGIAR (or SIAC). The activity budget of SPIA identified in this WorkPlan and budget request for 2014 (Tables 1-3) is directed entirely as complementary funding towards the accomplishment of the SIAC program within the overall funding for the SIAC project (identified for all three years in Annex A)

### ***8. SIAC Objective 1: Develop, pilot and verify innovative methods for collection and assembly of diffusion data***

Underpinning this objective is the development of a robust set of methods for routinely tracking adoption of CGIAR-related technologies in a cost-effective manner. Such information is a prerequisite for achieving the highest quality assessment of outcomes and impacts. A set of activities will test innovative ways of assessing the adoption of improved varieties of crops, livestock and fish technologies, agronomic and natural resource management interventions, with the goal of eventually embedding protocols derived on these tests into large-scale surveys carried out by others.

[SPIA contributes SPIA Chair, associate member and secretariat staff time to this objective but activities are funded by other elements of the SIAC funding and no further request is made from the budget of this WorkPlan.]

### **9. SIAC Objective 2: Institutionalize the collection of the diffusion data needed to conduct critical CGIAR impact evaluations**

The objective here is to compile and make available the best information on outcomes that are at least plausibly attributable to CGIAR research outputs, and on a large-scale. This is where a key bench-marking function for the CRPs is most obviously fulfilled by this program. Large gaps in existing adoption databases for genetic improvement technologies (Activity 2.1), natural resource management technologies (Activity 2.2) and policy-oriented research (Activity 2.3) will be filled for priority regions. In addition, under Activity 2.4, the World Bank Living Standards Measurement Surveys-Integrated Surveys of Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) team and the CRPs will work together with NARS partners and statistical agencies to see how some of these processes can best be integrated into existing surveys to reduce cost and increase frequency of data collection.

[SPIA contributes SPIA Chair, associate member and secretariat staff time to this objective but activities are funded by other elements of the SIAC funding and no further request is made from the budget of this WorkPlan.]

### **10. SIAC Objective 3: Assess the full range of impacts from CGIAR research**

While work under Objectives 1 and 2 pave the way for future *ex post* impact assessment studies, Objective 3 activities are focused on carrying out a number of impact assessments of CGIAR research and development initiatives along the entire chain of causation - from research investments to the System-Level Outcomes. Since this causal chain is long and complex, SPIA will approach it from a number of different perspectives: long-term large-scale studies of impact for major areas of CGIAR investment (Activity 3.1); sets of short-term micro-scale impact studies using experimental and quasi-experimental methods (Activity 3.2) to provide evidence on the impact of CGIAR research-derived technologies to adopting households; studies of a number of under-evaluated areas of research (e.g. livestock; irrigation management - Activity 3.3); attracting and integrating a strong cadre of pre- and post-doctoral researchers into the *ex post* impact assessment activities of the CRPs and Centers (Activity 3.4) focusing on specific studies; a system-level meta-analysis of *ex post* IA of CGIAR research (Activity 3.5).

[USD 168,000 is allotted to this activity from the total budget request in 2014; see Tables 1 and 3]

### **11. SIAC Objective 4: Support the development of communities of practice for ex-post impact assessment**

The CGIAR will benefit from a structured attempt to support the existing capacity and some emerging collaborations on *ex post* impact assessment. Information-sharing and regular interaction are important in enabling the kinds of dialogue that can raise standards of impact assessment in the CGIAR, as well as ensuring that individuals have the skills that they need to be successful in their work. Activities towards this objective include a small grants program (Activity 4.1); a targeted program of capacity-building using competitive calls for collaborations with advanced research institutes / universities (Activity 4.2); conferences and workshops on impact assessment in 2014 in 2015 (Activity 4.3); support for independently reviewing and publishing quality ratings of impact assessment studies carried out by CRPs and Centers (Activity 4.4); maintenance and enhancement of the impact website (<http://impact.cgiar.org>) (Activity 4.5).

[USD 233,000 is allotted to this activity from the total budget request in 2014; see Tables 1 and 3]

## **12. SIAC Management and oversight**

The SIAC program is governed by a Program Steering Committee (PSC) comprised of the SPIA Chair; the SPIA secretary; a SPIA-appointed impact assessment advisor (independent from CGIAR); and a Representative from the Fund Council Committee on Evaluation and Impact Assessment. The following are observers at PSC meetings: a Senior Program Officer from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; the Head of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement; the CEO or nominated representative of the Consortium Office; and other SPIA Secretariat staff.

The primary functions of the PSC are twofold – to provide strategic guidance in terms of overall direction and appropriate emphasis across and within each of the four Objectives and to provide a quality-control function on the decision-making and output of the commissioned activities that comprise the bulk of the SIAC program of work. Operational tasks include: Appointing leaders of specific pieces of work (either through a competitive process or commissioning of consultants); approving operational plans that are developed by these activity leaders; setting priorities for competitive grants and approving criteria for evaluating proposals; making final selection of competitive grants; reviewing scheduled (early, mid-term and final) reports of large competitive grant projects; commissioning and receiving reports of internally commissioned external reviews of the full project; and, reviewing expenditures against budgets. The PSC will meet face-to-face once a year, and will be convened by teleconference whenever required (not more than once every two months).

Technical and administrative support to the PSC is provided by the SPIA/ISPC secretariat. Their key duties and functions include: developing agendas for and summarizing key outcomes and action points from PSC bi-monthly meetings; reviewing individual Objective WP & B documents and various outputs (reports, scoping papers, call for proposals, etc.) from Objective Team Leaders and summarizing key points for the PSC; keeping abreast of progress in achieving milestone deliverables against project timeframes; helping the PSC in establishing priorities for competitive grants and the Objective Team Leaders in developing appropriate criteria consistent with those priorities; developing templates and scoring cards as required in evaluating competitive grant proposals; liaising with the Consortium Office on management of BMGF funds for SIAC on behalf of the SPIA Chair on a range of operational and implementation issues (reporting, meeting dates and places, etc.); planning and managing the mid-term internally commissioned external review of SIAC; undertaking periodic review of SIAC expenditures budgets; compiling annual technical and financial reports for FC and BMGF; and, providing hands-on leadership for managing Objective 4 activities and coordinating some of Objective 3 activities.

[USD 92,000 is allotted to this activity from the total budget request in 2014; see Tables 1 and 3.]

## **ISPC Communications**

The ISPC continues to seek to make its study reports, commentaries and general advice widely available in a cost effective manner. It anchors its approach in its independent status and the provision of evidence-based advice for agricultural research, research mobilization and impact analysis, and not advocacy. Recognizing that websites provide a major interface

with its target audiences (the Fund Council; the CRPs, Consortium and CGIAR scientists; the global audience of research and development scientists interested in the fields of focus and who represent potential CGIAR partners) further changes will be made to the ISPC and *impact* websites before the end of 2013, to increase their utility, the availability of materials and enhance the visual identity of the ISPC. Further updates in capacity and interactivity were made in relation to the Science Forum as well as the instigation of a Chair's Newsletter. For 2014, a communication strategy will be implemented focusing on publications and recommendations arising from ISPC activities, most notably the Science Forum on nutrition and health, the studies of conservation agriculture, biotechnology, metrics, a workshop on routes to poverty and the outputs of the DIIVA impact study.

[Communication activities are supported from Secretariat staff time, and consultant support for website and publication design. Publication costs are in general met from the ISPC activity budgets.]

## **Budget**

The ISPC Budget request for 2014 is USD 3.731 million, of which USD 2.407 million is requested from CGIAR Funds (system costs) and USD 1.324 million from the FAO.

The request is similar to previous annual requests by the ISPC with some variation within the suite of activities proposed for 2014 (Table 1 and Table 3), and in a year when Independent Program Review costs are reduced (as compared with, for instance, 2012 and anticipated for 2015).

Table 2 provides details of the budget for Council and Secretariat by expense item compared with 2013 and 2012.

The Council currently operates with a Chair and 5 members and the Chair of SPIA. As described in the text, there will be some Council turnover moving from 2013 to 2014 but overall costs are expected to remain the same. The Chair package is an estimate until such time as a new Chair is identified. SPIA calls on the support of two additional associate Panel members. In 2014, a third associate panel member position is planned with the expanded scope of SIAC and 30 days are allotted to the honoraria and per diem costs of the Council. However, this is estimated to be accommodated at the same overall budget in 2014 as this is a non-Science Forum year.

Full time equivalent staff in the ISPC Secretariat (FTE, Table 2) include 7 professional staff (1xD1, 3xP5, 1xP4 and 2xP3), the same as in 2012. There has however been turnover; 2013 saw the arrival of the second P3 (August) to fill the vacancy from 2012 and to complete the professional complement, but a long standing P5 member of the Secretariat left to join the IEA in the last quarter of this year. This position will be filled in 2014 to restore the professional staff capacity. There is no change in the administrative staff (general staff) complement (1xGS6, 1xGS4, 1xGS3) but SIAC program management will be augmented through consultancy arrangements. The variance in staff cost estimates comes from the professional turnover and the expected strengthening of the US dollar versus salary costs paid in Euros.

In 2013 to 2015, the activities of SPIA are co-incident with that of the SIAC program. The ISPC budget provides continuing support for the time of the SPIA Chair, associate members and Secretariat staff and contributes a sum similar to that for SPIA activities in 2012/13 (Tables 1 and 2) to a sub-set of SIAC activities identified in Table 3. SIAC is a major new undertaking for the system and its three year budget and funding sources are described in Annex A.

Budget table 1: ISPC activities 2013/2014

Activity	2013 (USD '000)	2014 (USD '000)
<b>STRATEGY AND TRENDS</b>		
1. A Strategic study of biotechnology in the CGIAR		80
2. Study of the effects of Development Corridors for CGIAR research		100
3. The CGIAR interface with the private sector, present and future		30
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT PROGRAM REVIEW</b>		
4. Assistance to the Consortium for future CRP development: guidelines and metrics		50
5. Means to address poverty in theory and practice: pathways emerging from the CRP portfolio (workshop in conjunction with SIAC objective 4)		55
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>40*</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>MOBILIZING SCIENCE AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS</b>		
6. Dissemination of the Science Forum outcomes for enhancing nutrition outcomes from agricultural research		30
7. Study of research for development partnerships emerging for the CRP portfolio		75
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>		
8. SIAC Objective 1: Develop, pilot and verify innovative methods for collection and assembly of diffusion data		-
9. SIAC Objective 2: Institutionalize the collection of the diffusion data needed to conduct critical CGIAR impact evaluations		-
10. SIAC Objective 3: Assess the full range of impacts from CGIAR research		168
11. SIAC Objective 4: Support the development of communities of practice for ex-post impact assessment		233
12. SIAC Management and oversight		92
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>493</b>
<b>TOTAL Activities</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>913</b>

## Note to Budget Table 1:

The comparable activity to Activity 5 under IPR in 2013, "Defining outcomes" resulted in three SLO-related white papers – a theoretical paper which introduced the idea of IDOs was accomplished using Secretariat staff time at no additional cost; a cross CRP analysis of theories of change utilized the budgeted amount of USD 20,000, and the SLO linkage paper, an additional request from the FC and Consortium cost USD 100,000 (for workshop and background papers) which was accommodated by an underspend on staff in early 2013.

Budget Table 2: ISPC Budget 2014 by expense item compared with 2013 and 2012 actuals

<b>ISPC BUDGET Table 2</b> in US\$000				
<b>EXPENSE ITEMS</b>	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2013 Actual	2014 Budget
<b>Council:</b> (including activities and Council Meetings)				
<i>Honoraria (Chair and Office)</i>	323	330		330
<i>Honoraria (Council and Panel Members)</i>	240	270		270
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>600</b>		<b>600</b>
<b>Technical Activities</b>				
<i>Independent Program Review</i>	54	40		105
<i>Impact Assessment</i>	346	500		493
<i>Strategy and Trends</i>	259	165		210
<i>Mobilizing linkages/partnerships</i>	25	180		105
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>885</b>		<b>913</b>
<b>Personnel Costs (Secretariat/Office)</b>				
<i>Professional staff</i>	955	1,547		1,495
<i>Administrative support</i>	242	272		298
<i>Long term Consultant</i>				**
<i>Short term Consultant</i>	59	75*		50
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1,894</b>		<b>1,843</b>
<b>Number of staff (Full Time equivalent)</b>				
<i>Professional staff</i>	6.00	7.00		7.00
<i>Administrative Support</i>	3.00	3.00		3.00
<i>Number of Long Term Consultants</i>				1.00**
<b>Total FTE</b>	9.00	10.00		11.00
<b>Travel</b>				
<i>Travel and Per diem (Chair, Council and Panel Members)</i>	170	225		225
<i>Travel and Per Diem (Office/Secretariat)</i>	78	100		100
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>325</b>		<b>325</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>				
<i>ISPC miscellaneous operating expenses</i>	44	50		50
<b>Overhead Charges</b>				
<i>IT Charges</i>				
<i>Rent</i>				
<i>Legal Services</i>				
<i>Contractual Services</i>				
<i>Supplies and Miscellaneous</i>				
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>50</b>		<b>50</b>
<b>Carry Forward from previous year</b>			78§	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,795</b>	<b>3,754</b>		<b>3,731</b>
<b>FINANCING</b>				
<i>From the CGIAR Fund</i>	2,098	2,430		<b>2,407</b>
<i>From FAO</i>	1,324	1,324		<b>1,324</b>

Notes to Budget Table 2:

\*A consultant, originally budgeted as short term, worked for 220 days in 2013 as maternity leave cover for one staff member and providing additional communication and management expertise for the Science Forum. Additional costs met from staff savings from late appointment of P3 staff.

A short term consultant (55 days) provided additional support for managing travel and budget for the Science Forum

\*\* In 2014, a long term consultant (11 months) will be hired for budget management and program management assistance for the SIAC program. This position is included as FTE in this table although costs are met directly by SIAC funds.

§Allowed carryover of FAO funds within their biennium 2012/2013. In contrast, the unspent balance of CGIAR Funds in 2012 was returned.



Budget table 3: SIAC activities funded through the ISPC WP&B 2014

Activity	2013 (USD)	2014 (USD)
<b>8. SIAC Objective 1: Develop, pilot and verify innovative methods for collection and assembly of diffusion data</b>		
Funded by W1 and BMGF only		
<b>9. SIAC Objective 2: Institutionalize the collection of the diffusion data needed to conduct critical CGIAR impact evaluations</b>		
Funded by W1 and BMGF only		
<b>10. SIAC Objective 3: Assess the full range of impacts from CGIAR research</b>		
Program asst for call on nutrition		23,433
Competitive - collecting experimental / on-farm trial data as basis for IA		45,000
Competitive - Grants for conducting RCTs on promising technologies		100,000
<b>11. SIAC Objective 4: Support the development of communities of practice for ex-post impact assessment</b>		
Small grants to support IA community of practice		75,000
Poverty technical workshop - Jan 2014		74,500
Quality-rating process for impact assessments conducted by the CGIAR centers & CRPs		4,635
Maintain and upgrade the CGIAR Impact website		26,780
Admin support to Objective 4		51,719
<b>12. SIAC Management and oversight</b>		
External review of the impact and influence of past assessment studies		51,500
PSC members travel to annual review meetings		21,630
PSC members to individual Activity meetings		10,815
ISPC secretariat travel to individual Activity meetings		7,210
<b>Total</b>		<b>492,222</b>

Budget table 4: SIAC expense items funded through the ISPC WP&B 2014

Expense type	2013 (USD)	2014 (USD)
Sub-grants		220,000
Consulting – technical activities		4,635
Consulting – support activities		101,932
Workshops / Travel		114,155
Other – Review of influence of past studies		51,500
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>492,222</b>

For complete three-year budget (2013 – 2015) for SIAC - detailing additional contributions from BMGF, W1 funds and IFAD - see annex A

<b>Annex A - Summary of SIAC Program budget</b>		3-year totals (2013 – 2015), by activity by donor		<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>W1<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>BMGF<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>ISPC WP+B</b>	<b>IFAD<sup>6</sup></b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Innovative methods for adoption / diffusion data collection</b>			<b>1843000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1843000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
1.0	Cross-cutting costs for Objective 1			726500	0	726500	0	0
1.1	Methods for tracking adoption of improved varieties			613250	0	613250	0	0
1.2	Methods for tracking natural resource management technologies			338250	0	338250	0	0
1.3	New institutional approaches for collecting adoption / diffusion data			137500	0	137500	0	0
1.4	Disseminate best practice			27500	0	27500	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>Institutionalization of adoption / diffusion data across research areas</b>			<b>4372000</b>	<b>3061590</b>	<b>1310411</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2.0	Cross-cutting costs for Objective 2			562411	0	562411	0	0
2.1	Crop-country estimates of improved variety adoption			1273800	855800	418000	0	0
2.2	Technology-country estimates of NRM adoption			1347500	1182500	165000	0	0
2.3	Database on policy-oriented research outcomes			176790	99790	77000	0	0
2.4	Long-term institutionalization of outcomes data collection			1011500	923500	88000	0	0
<b>3</b>	<b>Assess the full range of impacts from CGIAR research</b>			<b>3677083</b>	<b>1023579</b>	<b>1148504</b>	<b>200000</b>	<b>1305000</b>
3.1	Long-term large-scale ex-post IA studies			1440890	200022	335868	0	905000
3.2	Short-term, micro-level IAs with experimental and quasi-experimental methods			386591	130591	56000	200000	0
3.3	Ex post IAs of under-evaluated areas			993227	256591	736636	0	0
3.4	Pre- and post-doctoral research fellowships			760895	340895	20000	0	400000
3.5	System-level synthesis/meta-analysis of post-2000 conducted CGIAR impact studies			95481	95481	0	0	0
<b>4</b>	<b>Developing an impact assessment community of practice</b>			<b>914591</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>914591</b>	<b>0</b>
4.0	Cross-cutting support for Objective 4			155338	0	0	155338	0
4.1	Small grants program			225000	0	0	225000	0
4.2	Targeted capacity-building through collaborations with universities (competitive call)			285481	0	0	285481	0
4.3	Conferences / workshops on impact assessment			154500	0	0	154500	0
4.4	Quality ratings of impact assessments carried out by the CRPs/Centers			13909	0	0	13909	0
4.5	Significantly enhance the <a href="http://impact.cgiar.org">http://impact.cgiar.org</a> website			80363	0	0	80363	0
<b>Oversight</b>	<b>Oversight, Management and M&amp;E</b>			<b>1018429</b>	<b>367953</b>	<b>316431</b>	<b>281000</b>	<b>53045</b>
O1	Financial management			200909	100454	100454	0	0
O2	Administrative coordinator			361635	180818	180818	0	0
O3	Admin support			70318	35159	35159	0	0
O4	PSC members travel to annual review meetings			64909	0	0	64909	0
O5	PSC members to individual Activity meetings			42954	0	0	42954	0
O6	ISPC secretariat travel to individual Activity meetings			21636	0	0	21636	0
O7	Internal Review/Donor Surveys			100000	0	0	100000	0
O8	External review of the impact and influence of past assessment studies			104545	0	0	51500	53045
O9	External review of the impact and influence of SIAC project			51523	51523	0	0	0
<b>Direct Costs</b>				<b>11725104</b>	<b>4453122</b>	<b>4618346</b>	<b>1395613</b>	<b>1358045</b>
	IDCs (to Consortium)			0	0	364849	0	135805
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,225,758</b>				<b>4,453,100</b>	4,983,195	1,395,613	1,493,850

<sup>4</sup> W1 funding approved by Fund Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2013.

<sup>5</sup> BMGF funding is from a bilateral contract with the Consortium Office for 3 years (2013 – 2015).

<sup>6</sup> IFAD funding is from an expected bilateral contract with the Consortium Office, with funding applications made annually.

## Annex B: Status Report on ISPC activities continuing or completed in 2013

Activity	Status
<b>STRATEGY AND TRENDS (2013 WP)</b>	
<b>A strategic study of biotechnology in CGIAR</b>	Continuing. An expert Panel has been formed and a semi-final report to be completed at the end of 2013. A workshop on the outcomes and recommendations of the study will be a new activity and budget item for 2014.
<b>Indicators, metrics and data</b>	Continuing. An expert panel has been convened and will meet in September 2013 and final workshop in December 2013; semi-final report to be completed at the end of 2013 and published early 2014.
<b>STRATEGY AND TRENDS (2012 WP)</b>	
<b>Finding convergence on views of the future</b>	Completed. Study of the future of farm size and demand resulting from urbanization convened in September 2012 and synthesis report following an expert workshop presented in April 2013 entitled: " <i>ISPC Foresight Study on Trends in Urbanization and Changes in Farm Size in Developing Countries: Implications for Agricultural Research</i> ". Published together with ISPC commentary in May 2013 on the ISPC website.
<b>Prioritization of CGIAR activities</b>	Completed. ISPC White Paper on " <i>Strengthening Strategy and Results Framework through prioritization</i> " provided to Consortium in June 2012 and incorporated into Consortium's Plan of Action for a revised SRF.
<b>Seeking efficiencies in the portfolio approach.</b>	Completed. The ISPC commissioned four review papers on the role of <i>Conservation Agriculture in the CGIAR</i> , and debated the findings at workshop held at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, USA October 15-16 2012. Two major outputs from this study are: the Nebraska Declaration on Conservation Agriculture (a negotiated consensus statement from 45 scientists involved in

	the workshop); and a special issue of the journal <i>Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment</i> , comprising 14 papers led by authors involved in the workshop (to be published in 2013).
<b>INDEPENDENT PROGRAM REVIEW (2013 WP)</b>	
<b>Defining Outcomes</b>	<p>Completed. ISPC reviewed CRP proposals for IDOs at the initial and more advanced stages and organized a joint ISPC-CRP workshop at CIAT in March 2013.</p> <p>An additional paper on “<i>CGIAR System-Level Outcomes (SLOs), their impact pathways and inter-linkages</i>” not originally scheduled in WP&amp;B 2013, was developed following an expert workshop and a report presented verbally to the April Fund Council meeting in 2013. This was finalized and published as the third of the white papers on the ISPC website as a further input into CRP and SRF development.</p>
<b>Livestock as a cross cutting theme in the CRP portfolio</b>	Completed. A final report has been provided by the Panel Chair and will be discussed at ISPC 8 in September 2013. The ISPC will publish the report and its commentary and recommendations in 2013.
<b>INDEPENDENT PROGRAM REVIEW (from 2012 WP completed in 2013)</b>	
<b>Completion of the CRP proposal review process</b>	Completed. Commentaries on a further 8 reviews of CRP proposals or the Must-haves for proposals undergoing re-review were conducted in 2012. These were completed with the ISPC commentary on CRP 1.1, Drylands, in early 2013.
<b>Guidance review of the CRP portfolio</b>	Completed. A cross CRP-study of the CRP portfolio has been convened by the ISPC with special attention to Theories of change and impact pathway analysis, seed systems and the value-chain approach as cross cutting themes. The report title “ <i>Strategic overview of CGIAR Research programs Part I. Theories of Change and Impact Pathways</i> ” was

	made available to the Consortium and Fund Council in December 2012 and forms the second of three white papers on IDOs, Theories of Change and SLO linkages produced by the ISPC in 2012-13.
<b>Additional commentaries provided at the request of the Fund Council</b>	Completed. The ISPC developed a) a commentary and suggestions on the draft open access policy of the CGIAR which was submitted to the Fund Council in July 2013; b) a report on the CGIAR gender strategy is in preparation.
<b>MOBILIZING SCIENCE AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP (2013 WP)</b>	
<b>Science Forum 2013</b>	Continuing. A steering committee was formed in late 2012, and Science Forum held the subject of human nutrition and health outcomes; targets for agricultural research with BMZ in Bonn, Germany, 22-23 Sept. 2013. A workshop summary (2013), a brief on key messages (2013) and a scientific publication on the findings of the Science Forum (2014) are all planned or in process.
<b>Follow up workshop for 2013</b>	The ISPC Chair of the Science Forum will present to the Technical Meeting of ICN2 in November 2013 and a scientific publication and follow up workshop is now planned for 2014.
<b>MOBILIZING SCIENCE AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP (2012 WP completed in 2013)</b>	
<b>i) Publishing the 2011 outputs</b>	A Summary of the Science Forum 2011, Beijing, China and an ISPC Brief on the outcomes have been published on the ISPC website in early 2012. Key scientific papers from the forum have been published in a special volume of PNAS in May 2013. " <i>Agriculture innovation to protect the environment</i> ".
<b>ii) Other means of sharing the 2011 outputs – Workshop</b>	The outcomes have been incorporated also into the NRM Stripe review and were presented at the GCARD 2012 and to a meeting of European funders to the CGIAR in October 2012.

<b>INDEPENDENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT (2013 WP)</b>	
<b>Stripe impact review of Legume research in the CGIAR</b>	Continuing from 2012. Adoption surveys of chickpea varieties in Andhra Pradesh (ICRISAT) and Madhya Pradesh (NCAP) have been completed, and the reports are being reviewed by SPIA. SPIA has also recruited a consultant expert to draft the final report on this study (drawing on these two adoption surveys as well as data collected for other legume crops under the DIIVA project; a 2011 scoping study; LSMS-ISA data for cowpea in Nigeria, etc) expected end November 2013.
<b>Donor survey on impact assessment demand and utilisation</b>	Continuing from 2012. SPIA will work on this in September / October 2013, in liaison with the recently established Fund Council Committee on Impact Assessment and Evaluation.
<b>Communication and outreach (SPIA)</b>	Continuing: SPIA have retained the services of website consultant in managing the development of the <a href="http://impact.cgiar.org">http://impact.cgiar.org</a> website.
<b>Assess the full range of impacts from CGIAR research (new objective 3**)</b>	Continuing (this WP)
<b>Supporting the development of communities of practice for ex post impact assessment within the CGIAR (new objective 4**)</b>	Continuing (this WP)
<b>INDEPENDENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT (2012 WP)</b>	
<b>Poverty Impact Study</b>	Continuing: Three competitively commissioned impact studies (IRRI; CIMMYT; WorldFish) have been completed and externally peer-reviewed. SPIA will commission a further consultant to draft an overall synthesis report.  A workshop on poverty impacts (to be funded from the SIAC program) is being planned for Jan / Feb 2014 to learn the methodological and operational lessons from these studies, and discuss the implications for SRF and wider strategic

	questions about targeting poverty impacts from CGIAR research.
<b>Diffusion and Impact of Improved Varieties in Africa Study</b>	<p>Project completed; final publication in process. The main outputs from this project are as follows:</p> <p>1) A searchable web-based dataset of around 150 crop-country combinations  <a href="http://asti.cgiar.org/diiva">http://asti.cgiar.org/diiva</a></p> <p>2) A 20-chapter book with the working title “Improved varieties of food crops in Sub-Saharan Africa: Assessing progress in the generation, adoption and impact of new technologies” edited by Tom Walker and Jeff Alwang.</p> <p>3) A synthesis report (Tom Walker) and four impact case-study reports (rice Africa Rice; sorghum and millet ICRISAT; maize CIMMYT; sweet potato and beans CIP/CIAT) which have been peer-reviewed and are (as of 23<sup>rd</sup> Aug 2013) being revised and made ready for posting on the <a href="http://impact.cgiar.org">http://impact.cgiar.org</a> website. They will also be incorporated in the chapters of the book.</p>
<b>Meta-analysis of CGIAR impact (10-year update)</b>	Not done: Absorbed into the activities of the new SIAC program
<b>IAAE Meeting Special Session on Impact Assessment</b>	Near completion: SPIA is editing a special issue of Food Policy, featuring the six best papers presented at the pre-conference workshop on impact assessment in Foz do Iguacu, Brazil, August 2012. The peer-review process is complete and the issue should be published in October / November 2013.
<b>Stripe impact review</b>	Not done: Absorbed into the activities of the new SIAC program