

Responses to the “Must haves” comments on CRP2 from the ISPC and the FC (FC decision, July 11, 2011)

This document contains the draft responses to the “Must haves” comments formulated in the FC decision dated July 11, 2011:

- ✓ comments from the ISPC (Section 1)
- ✓ comments from the FC (Section 2).

SECTION 1. COMMENTS FROM THE ISPC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents’ response and changes made
<p><i>1) Analysis and articulation of the major problems and opportunities for research related to agricultural and rural development policies, institutions and markets</i></p>	<p>The version of the proposal submitted earlier included a description of key development challenges related to agriculture and rural development (Section 1). However, we recognize that this material is quite general; the description of the proposed themes and subthemes is also written at a relatively general level given the constraints of the proposal format. To better reflect the heterogeneity in the relative importance of problems and opportunities across regions, we have added a new table (Table 3.1, Section 3) that provides a typology of countries or major subnational regions in terms of characteristics, development challenges, approach/strategy, and CRP2 research areas.</p> <p>The three types of countries or major subnational regions listed in this table (agriculture-based, transforming, and urbanized) are based on the main characteristics of countries’ agricultural development, and are drawn from the World Development Report (WDR 2008). Following from this typology and based on our own analysis and other literature referenced in the table, we have identified the key development challenges (column 2 of the table) and development approaches and strategies (column 3) for each type. Based on this assessment, we have specified the key CRP2 research areas at a more detailed level and categorized them by subtheme for each type of country or region (column 4).</p> <p>It should be noted that some research areas cut across the different types of countries or subnational regions. For example, Subtheme 1.1 on Foresight and Strategic Scenarios is a global activity, designed to capture how global drivers and scenarios influence countries throughout the world while capturing the interconnections of agricultural markets and the global externalities of climate change.</p> <p>-At this early stage, the typology outlined in Table 3.1 does not fully capture the complexity of some large countries in which significant differences are found across regions.</p> <p>Research priorities across types of countries and regions will be further developed within the participatory priority-setting process that will be established during the program implementation phase. More details about Table 3.1 and the priority-setting process can be found in Section 3 of the proposal.</p>

SECTION 1. COMMENTS FROM THE ISPC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<p>2) <i>Development of a strategic framework that encompasses (in addition to point above):</i></p> <p><i>a. analysis and elaboration of CGIAR's comparative advantage in addressing specific development issues through research on policies, institutions and markets, against the backdrop of relevant alternative suppliers</i></p> <p><i>b. articulation of the major priorities and rationale for them</i></p>	<p>a. Comparative advantage of CRP2</p> <p>The previous version of the proposal briefly discussed the comparative advantage of the CGIAR, in Section 1 and Section 4 (for the different subthemes). In the revised version of the proposal, we explore the different forms of this comparative advantage in much more detail. Each subtheme description now provides more information on important/significant alternative suppliers and the nature of CRP2's comparative advantage over them (in "Comparative advantage of CRP2" paragraphs at the end of each subtheme description). For convenience, extensive information about CRP2's alternative suppliers has also been compiled into a table (Annex 5). Please note that most alternative suppliers are also, by design, partners in CRP2. We prefer to think of most of these as joint suppliers of joint products.</p> <p>b. Priority-setting</p> <p>Each research subtheme prioritizes key research questions and research activities. Several of the early priorities reflect ongoing work. The new table described in our response to ISPC comment number 1 above (Table 3.1) specifies research areas by country type based on the analysis of major development challenges and strategies for each type.</p> <p>Moreover, a rigorous participatory priority-setting process will be established during the early implementation phase of CRP2. This approach was endorsed at the July 6–7 Fund Council meeting. (See FC decision: "At the FC meeting, it was recognized that addressing some of the above (e.g., point 2) would take time and could be done during implementation planning.")</p> <p>The first of a series of participatory regional priority-setting workshops will take place in Alexandria, Egypt, November 28–29, 2011, within the frame of the Conference on Setting Priorities for Food Security and Poverty Reduction in the Arab World. Other regional priority-setting exercises will be planned in due course and will take place in the first months of 2012. We are also planning to hold a global priority-setting workshop to finalize the first stage of the priority-setting process by July 2012. These workshops might result in adjustments of priorities, as will other global and regional developments over time. More details about the priority-setting process can be found in Section 3 of the proposal, which has been expanded.</p>

SECTION 1. COMMENTS FROM THE ISPC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<p>3) Enumeration of the value added of this CRP over existing work, particularly via collaborations within the CGIAR</p>	<p>CRP2 will for the first time bring together analysis of policies and institutions related to food security, poverty, and sustainable agriculture from across the CGIAR. It will combine research expertise in both the social and the biophysical sciences at key CGIAR centers to find ways to enhance agricultural productivity while reducing rural poverty and improving outcomes for the environment. CRP2 will thus be one of the largest food policy research program focused on improving outcomes for the rural poor in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The program will be a platform of excellence drawing on the expertise of the CG system, other research and development organizations, and development partners to advance research and research-based capacity building. An important feature of this program is the support for country-led, country-driven, and country-owned policies and strategies.</p> <p>In further communication with ISPC regarding this comment, we were asked to focus proposal revisions on two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collaboration between CRP2 and other CRPs b. Collaboration between IFPRI and other centers <p>a. Collaboration between CRP2 and other CRPs</p> <p>The proposal provides both general principles about collaboration between CRP2 and other CRPs, expressed in Sections 2 and 3, and specific information about the division and collaboration between different lines of work between CRP2 and other CRPs, in Section 4 by subtheme and in Section 7 (paragraph "Boundaries between CRP2 and other CRPS," and Table 7.1). A description of modes of collaboration between CRP2 and other CRPs is presented in detail in Annex 2 and Annex 3 of the proposal.</p> <p>b. Collaboration between IFPRI and other centers</p> <p>The proposal (Sections 4 and 6, new Box 7.6, Box 8.2, and Annex 4) provides several examples of how CG centers will work together to achieve the goals set out under CRP2.</p> <p>We are aware that the complementarities and repartition of work between centers are better addressed for some subthemes than for others. We will use the first months of CRP2 implementation to finalize the repartition of roles and responsibilities among centers for each subtheme.</p>

SECTION 1. COMMENTS FROM THE ISPC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<p>4) <i>Description and reasonable expectations about outcomes and impact pathways</i></p>	<p>The previous version of the proposal contained a strategy to enhance probability of on-the-ground impact, which we have further expanded. To complement the existing material, we have strengthened the discussion in each subtheme description (Section 4) about the ways each subtheme's outputs will be translated into outcomes and impacts. The strategy includes the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Translation of research into outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Three impact pathways ○ Conditions to translate outputs into outcomes—salience, credibility, and legitimacy of research findings (Section 3) 2. Extensive language on four major vehicles that CRP2's strategy for impact builds upon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partnerships: linking research to on-the-ground implementation and widening CRP2's influence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3 ▪ Section 4, by subtheme (see for example Subtheme 2.3 on collective action) ▪ Section 7 ○ Capacity strengthening: enhancing the capacity of partners who will translate research results into on-the-ground impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 8 ○ Communication: producing the different forms of outputs that will ensure research dissemination and influence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3 ▪ Section 9 ○ Specific outreach strategies: to be developed by each subtheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3 ▪ Table 3.2 "Sample output, outcome, and impact indicators, by subthemes," now expanded and transformed into a performance indicators matrix (Annex 1), following the Consortium Office template 3. Examples of successes in achieving impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Country Strategy Support Programs to enhance the impact of CRP2 at country level (section 3; we have added two boxes, Box 3.4 and Box 3.5, describing how CSSPs in Ghana and Ethiopia have achieved impact on the ground) ○ Section 3, box 3.1 "Impact of CGIAR policy research" 4. Description of ways in which impact will be assessed and measured <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Measuring uptake and assessing impact: indicators, stakeholder feedback, KAP surveys, impact assessment methods (section 3) ○ Contribution of Subtheme 2.1 "Policy processes" to assessing the impact of CRP2's policy research ○ Contribution of Subtheme 3.2. "Impact of upgrading value chains" to assessing the impact of the value chains work

SECTION 2. COMMENTS FROM THE FC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<p><i>1) Need to address the concern that no adjustments were made in the budget in spite of a more focused proposal with a reduced number of subthemes</i></p>	<p>A budget is a best estimate of the financial resources required to meet programmatic objectives. In the original proposal, 2011 was considered to be Year 1. We acknowledge that, with the passing of almost a year since the proposal was reviewed, it is more likely that the first year of CRP2 will begin on January 1, 2012. Therefore, the Year 1 budget is likely to show an increase of 3% to 4%.</p> <p>The financial officers of the lead center and other participating centers are currently working together and with the Consortium to adjust budgets on a line item basis for 2012. This approach was agreed upon at a meeting of all the CGIAR centers Finance Officers in Washington DC on September 16, 2011. However, in terms of overall CRP2 budget costs, and by theme, we consider that the figures provided for CRP2 are reasonable.</p> <p>Two adjustments to the budget have been made in this new version of the proposal (Section 12). They reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The decision of IWMI to cancel its financial participation in CRP2 and to develop collaboration through cooperation between CRP2 and CRP5 - The need to increase the management budget, in order to ensure that enough funding is available for oversight, planning, coordination, priority-setting, monitoring, and evaluation, and communication. Enhanced implementation of these functions by all CRPs has been required by recent decisions of the Consortium. This increase is offset by the amount of CGIAR funding forecast for IWMI, while the total CRP2 budget is relatively unchanged compared to the previous submission. The CRP2 management budget is now 3.7% of CRP2's total budget, which is in line with the ratios in other CRPs.
<p><i>2) Clarify further how the sub-themes are linked to the main themes and to the overarching objectives of the CRP and their expected contribution to the CGIAR system level outcomes</i></p>	<p>Regarding the first part of the comment, we have added more information on the linkages between each theme and the corresponding subthemes in Section 4 (introductions to each theme).</p> <p>Regarding the second part of the comment, in order to clarify how each of the subthemes is contributing to the SLOs, we have broken out Table 2.1 (previous title: "How CRP2 themes contribute to the system-level outcomes of the CGIAR") by subtheme (new title: How CRP2 subthemes contribute to the system-level outcomes of the CGIAR"). This material can also be found in the performance indicators matrix (Annex 1) that has been newly prepared for this revised proposal.</p>
<p><i>3) Acknowledge that leading expertise on some of the issues to be addressed by the proposal exist outside the CGIAR, and specify how these teams would be identified and approached to seek their contributions to the CRP</i></p>	<p>This comment is very similar to ISPC comment number 2. Please see Section 1 above for how we responded to this comment.</p>

SECTION 2. COMMENTS FROM THE FC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<i>4) The demonstrable links to NARES and regional research bodies (APAARI, GFAR, etc.) in practice should be specified</i>	To illustrate collaboration with NARES and regional forums in practice, more specific examples of work with these organizations have been added in Sections 4, 5, and 7 (Box 7.1, Box 7.2, and Box 7.3). These examples show how CRP2 partnerships are already working at international, regional, and country levels. A total of about 400 NARSs work with one or another subtheme, with some (like KARI) collaborating on research on all subthemes (see Annex 6, "Partners of CGIAR centers participating in CRP2").
<i>5) Provide some indicators of short, medium, and longer term implementation strategies for the multifarious subject issues raised in the CRP</i>	It is a little too early to be able to provide realistic indications of the timeframe for the different activities. As a component of priority-setting, phasing will be handled during the priority-setting exercises to be carried out in the initial stages of CRP2 implementation, starting in November 2011. In some cases, priorities may translate into phasing of research components over time, while in some other cases, priorities will translate into differentiated funding allocation. The phasing of the research also includes an opportunistic component, so that it will not be determined entirely in the initial priority-setting process. See Section 3 of the proposal and the response above to ISPC comment number 2 on priority-setting for further details.
<i>6) Need to better articulate the impact pathway and the specific instruments (e.g., country strategies) along that pathway that can be used</i>	This comment is very similar to ISPC comment number 4. Please see Section 1 above for how we responded to this comment.
<i>7) Need clarity on how the other centers involved would participate in management and decisionmaking</i>	We view the participation of other centers to decisionmaking as a key component of CRP2's participative management and effectiveness. To clarify the different forms of centers' involvement (theme leaders, management committee, conflict resolution mechanisms, etc.), we have added a box on this topic in the Management section (Box 10.1, Section 10).

SECTION 2. COMMENTS FROM THE FC	
Comments expressed in FC decision	Proponents' response and changes made
<p><i>8) Should include a consolidated framework for data management across the centers with IFPRI playing a leading role in it</i></p>	<p>There is a high level of synergy between world-class research and world-class information systems, which means that data should be treated as a corporate research asset. The quality, credibility, and cost of CRP2 research, the program's capacity to develop timely, relevant, and accessible research products and services, and its ability to respond to evolving research priorities will all be highly conditioned by CRP2's data strategy. Therefore, the development of integrated data and knowledge management platforms is a priority of CRP2. CRP2's data strategy aims to reduce research costs, enrich analytical opportunities for CRP research partners, and deliver a major international public good in the form of an open-access data portal, which will foster broad opportunities for innovation beyond CRP2 by both the public and the private sectors. These objectives go well beyond existing practices for data management and sharing within and across CGIAR centers.</p> <p>To better reflect this, the section on Data Strategy (Section 6) has been considerably extended and deepened.</p>