

## Responses to the comments on CRP2 by the Fund Council (FC), ISPC, and GFAR (May 19, 2011)

**This document contains:**

- ✓ the responses to the comments formulated in the FC decision and “Must haves” (Part 1),
- ✓ the responses to other comments, from the FC (Part 2), the ISPC (Part 3), and GFAR (Part 4).
- ✓ explanations about how we have taken account of the “Guidelines for the development of a gender strategy in each CRP (April 2011)” (Part 5).

Please note:

- ✓ The order of the sections is not the same in the revised proposal compared to the previous version. In the present document, sections are designated by their number in the **revised** proposal.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents’ response and changes made
<b>PART 1: COMMENTS FROM THE FC DECISION AND “MUST HAVE”</b>		
<i>Rationale and strategic results framework</i>	1. Identify and elaborate key problems and opportunities for research on specific agricultural and rural development policies, investments, institutions and markets that offer greatest scope for measurable progress towards CGIAR goals.	The sections on rationale (Section 1) and strategic framework (Section 2) have been significantly rewritten and now clearly present the development challenges and opportunities motivating CRP2 and how CRP2’s research will address these development challenges and contribute to CGIAR system-level outcomes.
<i>Strategic results framework</i>	2. Further develop a strategic framework that encompasses, inter alia, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ clearer articulation of priorities and rationale for them,</li> <li>▪ an assessment of alternative research providers and CGIAR comparative advantage, and</li> <li>▪ a clear focus on production of well-defined and high priority International Public Goods.</li> </ul>	The section on strategic framework (Section 2) has been significantly rewritten. A figure (Figure 2.1) has been added to depict the links between the themes. A table (Table 2.1) has been added to illustrate ways that each of the themes contributes to achieving the CGIAR system-level outcomes. An assessment of alternative research providers and CGIAR’s comparative advantage has been added at the end of the Rationale section (Section 1) and at the beginning of the Partnerships section (Section 7). The section on priority setting (in Section 3) has been refined to clearly articulate the process for priority setting; each subtheme also elaborates further on setting priorities (Section 4). The focus on IPGs has been enhanced to better show how they contribute to knowledge generation and development outcomes (Sections 2, 3, 4).
<i>Strategic results framework</i>	3. Apply the strategic framework to develop a more focused and coherent research program around major constraints and opportunities that references earlier IFPRI work.	The strategic framework has been revised and applied to develop a more focused and consolidated research program, with fewer subthemes and activities. The themes and subthemes have been revised to clarify their focus, and activities have been integrated more effectively into fewer subthemes (Section 4) that clearly address development challenges, constraints

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
		and opportunities.
<i>Outcomes and impacts</i>	4. Elaborate more specifically the key outcomes and impacts being targeted by sub-themes at different scales (global, regional, national) or activities, and their impact pathway narratives.	The section on “priority setting, impact pathways, monitoring, and evaluation” (Section 3, previously Section 10 in the February draft) has been significantly re-written, and the figure about impact pathways has been revised to depict impact pathways more clearly (Figure 3.1). The linkages between outputs, outcomes, and impacts are also spelled out more clearly for each subtheme (Section 4).
<i>Partnerships</i>	5. Elaborate further the specific roles and synergies of IFPRI and other CGIAR and non-CGIAR partners working together, and independence of the Scientific Advisory Panel.	The roles of IFPRI, other CGIAR centers, and non-CGIAR partners and the synergies between them have been described in the section on partnerships (Section 7) as well as for each subtheme (Section 4). The independent role of the Scientific Advisory Panel has been explained in Section 10 (Management arrangements for CRP2 implementation). We have added an annex (Annex 4) listing the current partners of CRP2, which has over 500 partners.
<i>Strategic results framework</i>	6. Identify the value added by the proposed work in CRP2.	This is addressed in the revised sections 1, 2 and 4.
<i>Comparative advantage</i>	7. Focus on core competencies and comparative advantage of CRP2.	This has been spelled out more clearly and in more detail in Section 1 (Rationale), as well as in the description of the themes and subthemes in Section 4 for specific areas of research. Additional discussion of comparative advantage and how it frames partnerships is provided in the Partnerships section (Section 7).
<i>Outcomes and impacts</i>	8. Move from generic outputs to measurable ones with indicators that can be linked to specific timeframes.	Measurable outputs and high level impacts are provided in Section 3. In this section we also discuss the methodology used to obtain these results, as well as the difficulties of quantifying the impacts of policy research, and how CRP2 will address these difficulties in its M&E framework.
<i>Outcomes and impacts</i>	9. Provide convincing story on how research outputs will be converted into development outcomes.	This narrative has been strengthened in Section 3 and in Section 4. The role of country strategy support programs (CSSPs) in converting research outputs to development outcomes has been emphasized in Section 4.
<i>Partnerships</i>	10. Articulate how the consortium will partner with and complement the social science work in the commodity and resource-based CGIAR centers.	Nearly all of the CGIAR centers are formal members of CRP2, and social scientists from the Centers were heavily involved in the preparation of CRP2. Other centers will be represented on the Management Committee of CRP2. A description of modes of collaboration between other CRPs and CRP2 and between other Centers and CRPs is presented in detail in Section 7 on partnerships and in Annexes 1 and 2. We have also added an annex (Annex 4) listing the current partners of CRP2, that has over 500 partners.
<i>Partnerships</i>	11. Form close and integral partnership with the platforms and networks brought together through GFAR and regional bodies.	We have provided considerably more details of these partnerships in Subtheme 1.1, Subtheme 1.3, Subtheme 2.3, Theme 3, and strategic research on gender, and in Section 7 on partnerships. Annexes 1 and 2 provide detailed description of how CGIAR centers and other CRPs interact with CRP2. We have added an annex (Annex 4) listing the current partners of CRP2, that has over 500 partners.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
<i>Partnerships</i>	12. Clarify boundaries of foresight work relative to the one being undertaken by ISPC.	A paragraph explicitly addressing this has been added to the "Partnerships" section of Subtheme 1.1.
<i>Data strategy</i>	13. CRP2 should identify data gaps and how to increase efficiency in collecting data in different countries.	The attention paid to supporting the emergence and online publication of datasets as IPGs is continuously addressed throughout the proposal (Subthemes 1.1, 1.2, 2.4, 3.1, strategic research on gender, Section 9 on communication). In Subtheme 2.4, we have now included an explicit provision for continuous panel data collection in key countries on asset accumulation and its implications for managing food security, risk, and vulnerability. We have also integrated our approach to data management into a subsection on data strategy in Section 6, now called "Innovative Methods and Data Development".
	14. Consider research areas that seek to better understand the urban-rural poor interface.	Research on rural-urban linkages was already included in the previous version of the proposal and is described in Subtheme 1.2. in the current proposal.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
<b>PART 2: OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE FC</b>		
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	Subtheme 1.3 seems core to the CGIAR system. Is there any way to make this more central to the programme rather than one of six policy subthemes?	We agree that policy work on agricultural productivity enhancement has been and should remain at the core of CGIAR research, comparative advantage and expertise, as recently reaffirmed by the CGIAR Stripe Review of Social Sciences. This topic is addressed in Subtheme 1.3, and its centrality has been strengthened through better integration of the goals and activities of this topic to improve the focus and integration.
<i>Subtheme 1.4</i>	Why is “social protection” about enhancing productive investments? What about food safety nets, drought relief programmes, etc. that address food security? Isn't appraising and targeting of policies to the specific circumstances of the rural poor a more important issue to tackle first? Would this actually be tackled properly under the other sub-themes if not an explicit sub-theme on its own?	This comment from FC and another comment from ISPC shown on page 8 of this document provide somewhat different recommendations. ISPC recommends that the remit of this subtheme should be narrowed while the Fund Council argues that it should be expanded. After consultation with CGIAR scientists working on social protection issues and selected external stakeholders, as well as further review of CG reform documents (particularly the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework), we have chosen to follow the suggestion of the Fund Council. More specifically, we have strengthened the links between the work proposed under this subtheme and the System Level Outcomes “Reduce rural poverty” and “Increase food security”, noting that social protection contributes to these both directly through income transfers and indirectly through their enabling contribution to the adoption of new agricultural technologies.
<i>Subtheme 1.4</i>	With regard to social protection, and in particular the design of new insurance products and services, efforts should be made to ensure that they are demand driven and that the needs and priorities of women and men farmers is integrated and guide their design. This subtheme should particularly look at the situation of women and men farmers and female- and male-headed households, in order to ensure better informed and better targeted social protection policies.	We have incorporated this suggestion and revised the research questions in Subtheme 1.4 accordingly.
<i>Theme 2</i>	For the institutions theme, the main comment might again be concern about how well the CRP communicates. When the sub-themes are organized on the basis of issues such as “governance” and “collective action”, the research will have to deal with many different institutions. In practice, however, institutional strengthening is done with specific organizations or is targeted to specific sets of institutions. When providing	It is our intent to deal with different types of institutions and different aspects of institutional strengthening, as described in Theme 2 of the proposal. The plan to work in partnership with farmer organizations and governments and other development agencies will ensure that the questions addressed are relevant to them.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	<p>support for institutional strengthening, it is not often the case and should not be the case that only one aspect of institutional strengthening (such as governance) is addressed. The CGIAR will undoubtedly be able to generate some interesting publications on governance, collection action and property rights – but then comes the issue of moving research into reality.</p>	
<p><i>Theme 3</i></p>	<p>The value chains subtheme seems to be a small after thought, particularly compared to the scope of what is to be tackled at the policy level. It also appears that there has not been enough thinking – yet – on the interesting research questions associated with value chains perspectives and approaches. The issue of innovations in commodity markets is both interesting and important, but there are other important issues. What does the CGIAR have to say, for example, about prospects for the poor in chains for staple commodities targeted to local markets relative to chains for staples targeted to formal sector retail? What about fresh chains for perishables relative to chains leading to food manufacture? Are contractual arrangements in chains generating services that help the poor participate, or is the common wisdom that contracts are on balance bad for the poor valid? What are the advantages and disadvantages for the poor of policies and institutional support that rations services and incentives by focusing on specific chains? Are balanced chains inherently better for the poor than are chains governed by downstream buyers? To what extent should the focus be on linking farmers to current markets, versus restructuring of markets (e.g. collection centres, regional markets, etc.) and linking farmers to the restructured markets? Is the real issue even that of targeting specific “value chains” or is it really sub-sector development –</p>	<p>The value chains theme has been a key component of CRP2 from the beginning, and is of high importance to successfully addressing the development challenges described in Section 1 and elsewhere. As described in Section 4, this theme will examine prospects in local, regional, international, formal, and informal markets and will also focus on both high- and low-value commodity chains (such as staples).</p> <p>Contract farming could give smallholders access to dynamic markets, but several studies have shown that most of those traditional contract arrangements are problematic for both the companies and the farmers. Therefore, the innovative aspect of this theme is to implement field research tests with companies and producer organizations and validate innovative marketing arrangements (including contracts) to solve the problems faced by small farmers, particularly those growing high-value crops.</p> <p>The design includes a scaling up framework from the beginning. The proposal is designed to take advantage of the availability of extremely rich biophysical and detailed household survey data in order to construct a typology of microregions to better target the priority research themes and to assure potential scaling up of the different solutions to the bottlenecks identified across the priority value chains. The proactive engagement of multiple partners from research, policy, private firms, farmer organizations and NGOs enables processes of shared discovery and development in this research. This engagement ensures that partners with skills, interest and incentives to take insights to scale have early and consistent participation in learning processes and are thus well placed to implement positive innovations at a scale unreachable by research organizations alone.</p>

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	<p>which is the de facto focus of most “value chains” projects? What indeed is the experience in achieving replication and upscaling through value chains projects, relative to experiences in strengthening services that can support business and commercial activity in the agricultural sector?</p>	
<p><i>Theme 3</i></p>	<p>The questions could go on and on about value chains since it is such a fad now, as was farming systems more than two decades ago. There is no need for the CGIAR to take on the value chains topic since so many people are working on it now that they are tripping over each other. But if the CPR is going to tackle the key research and development issues involved in value chains and sustainability linking farmers to (changing) markets, it would seem that commodities market mechanisms and impact evaluation might be a start but far from sufficient, and perhaps not even the most important issues to be addressing. This is the reflection that we would suggest for the third theme as the CPR moves into implementation.</p>	<p>We question the statement that “there is no need for the CGIAR to take on the value chains topic”. The CGIAR centers have been heavily involved in value chain research and partnerships for many years. The specific justification for the CGIAR to engage in the value chain topic is the growing importance of value chains in shaping production possibilities and the implications of this in structuring research and development agendas. It is no accident that all CRPs include value chain components. Hence a key role of Theme 3 is to create an overarching theoretical framework to understand and address problems and opportunities in the value chain as they relate to the poor, in a complementary and iterative relationship to other CRPs. The term “Value Chain” is certainly associated with a fad, as noted by the reviewers. However, very few initiatives have been taken to develop tools for use in design and implementation of economics- and management-based change within value chains. The CG and other partners in CRP2 have a strong comparative advantage in this research, and the value chains theme in CRP2 maximizes complementarity with themes 1 and 2.</p>

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	<b>PART 3: COMMENTS FROM THE ISPC</b>	
<i>CSSPs</i>	The Country Strategic Support Programs (CSSPs) mentioned in Box 4.1 are a promising vehicle for lifting the CRP profile at the country level, staying close to the issues and facilitating the research and delivery of results in the developing world. More might have been said about the extent to which these have helped improve the uptake of IFPRI policy recommendations to date.	Box 4.1 has been rewritten according to this suggestion and examples of how CSSPs are helping improve the uptake of policy recommendations have been added.
<i>CSSPs</i>	Interestingly, no mention is made of the CSSPs in the discussion of “Ensuring Uptake” on pp. 80-81.	We now mention the experience of CSSPs in the revised Section 3 on “Priority Setting, Impact Pathways, Monitoring, and Evaluation”.
<i>CSSPs</i>	They (CSSPs) were not listed under sub-theme 1.6 in the text (though they are found there in Annex table 1).	The role of CSSPs has been added in the discussion of “Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts” under Subtheme 2.1.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	The research targets are very diffuse and poorly defined, such as the work on germplasm exchange.	We have improved the general focus of Subtheme 1.3 by integration of activities and reduction of the number of activities, in order to more clearly address high priority topics. A specific effort toward improved focus has been made on the sub-section where “germplasm exchange” was mentioned (now included in “Policies and strategies that facilitate access to improved crop cultivars and animal breeds”).
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	The rationale for a focus on policies to promote greater attention for new and underutilized species (p. 20) is not strong given that such work tends to be location-specific and difficult to scale up with very few success stories.	In many cases it is true that neglected and underutilized species (NUS), unlike commodity crops, can best be valued in specific contexts where their local adaptation traits can benefit specific production systems; their untapped nutritional values may best be valued within local food systems; their economic potential may be better captured within a specific market context; their cultural appreciation by local populations may be the best way to make the most effective use of their beneficial properties. However, while NUS are indeed more closely tied to local conditions than are major staple crops, the generic methodological frameworks created for realization of their benefits are composed of methods, approaches and tools of broader applicability and of relevance to a wide range of crops. The effectiveness of efforts in scaling up NUS work beyond the specific crop/ location through supportive policies will depend on our capacity to share best practices and lessons learnt from isolated scattered efforts around the world. Today a robust effort in this direction is still missing, and this is what we hope to achieve through the CRP2's work on NUS.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	The key policy questions to be addressed in projects relating to renewable energy and energy efficient agriculture are not articulated.	Land, water and energy use are interlinked—agricultural technology policies are often associated with increased energy use. Thus, it is important to include potential impacts on renewable energies into the assessment of sustainable

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
		agricultural productivity improvement. This is reflected in the revised Subtheme 1.3.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	The rationale for including work on sustainable natural resources management and carbon sequestration in this CRP is not provided.	This rationale is now addressed in Subtheme 1.3. This subtheme will work closely with CRP5 and CRP7, but will focus on sustainable productivity growth through the lens of policy and institutional issues in a manner that is holistic and systems-based rather than crop specific, taking an integrated macro-level policy view of micro-level evidence on crops, traits, resources, policies, and institutions. Policies on commodities (e.g., minimum support prices for food staples), policies on external inputs (e.g., subsidies on fertilizer, machinery and equipment), and policies on seeds and traits (e.g., public and private investment in hybrids and GM crops conducive to resource-conserving technologies) will be examined.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	No attention is given to seed systems, a major constraint on productivity growth in many poor countries.	In the process of better integrating the research program for Subtheme 1.3, text has been included that specifies the seed systems work more clearly.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	The use of nano-technology to improve agriculture in low-income developing countries seems like a long-shot. What specific examples of success do we have for use of nano-technology for agriculture in highly developed countries?	A recent review on the potential of nanotechnologies for the rural poor has found that little research on nanotechnologies has targeted the developing-country needs, and in particular the needs of the poor. The CGIAR could play a significant role in filling knowledge gaps in the transition between basic research and applied research to increase availability of nanotechnologies for the poor. A useful reference on this is: Gruere, G. C. Narrod and L. Abbott. 2011. Agricultural, Food, and Water Nanotechnologies for the Poor Opportunities, Constraints, and Role of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. IFPRI DP No. 1064. Washington DC: IFPRI.
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	Highlight ASTI, also part of data collection.	This has been done, see Subtheme 1.3.
<i>Subtheme 1.4</i>	While Subtheme 1.4 (social protection policies) is a topic of the highest importance, there are numerous other academic, think-tank and R&D organizations deeply involved in this broad area of development. To gain from CGIAR's comparative advantage, this sub-theme should focus more on links to agriculture.	Our initial plan for this subtheme was in fact to have a relatively narrow focus on the role of social protection for agriculture, and particularly on how social protection can reduce risks and stimulate agricultural income growth, asset preservation and accumulation. However, as described above in response to the FC comment (page 4), we have somewhat expanded the focus to strengthen the links between the work proposed under this subtheme and the System Level Outcomes "Reduce rural poverty" and "Increase food security", noting that social protection contributes to these both directly through income transfers and indirectly through their enabling contribution to the adoption of new agricultural technologies.
<i>Subtheme 2.4</i>	Subtheme 2.3 (now 2.4) on "institutions to strengthen the assets of the poor" lays out a highly interesting and very important development agenda, but its link to agriculture development is	We are surprised that the ISPC should say that "the link between assets and agricultural development is tenuous": a wide literature documents the link between asset ownership and control and the adoption of new agricultural technologies. More recent evidence also highlights the importance of secure

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	more tenuous. It remains to be seen to what extent and where the CGIAR with a budget of only \$6.7m should enter an already crowded field.	property rights on the adoption of environmentally sustainable techniques. References to this literature are now included in the text. IFPRI and other CGIAR centers have been leaders in developing work on the role of assets in agricultural development, not late-comers in a crowded field as implied by this comment.
<i>Budget</i>	Expenditures for subthemes 3.1 and 3.2 are missing from Table 13.7.	This has been corrected.
<i>Budget</i>	It also unclear why expenditures by CRP partners have large differences among CG Centers with comparable mandates (e.g., ICARDA versus ICRISAT or CIAT). Likewise, IRRI, CIFOR and Africa Rice do not appear in any budget although their policy related research needs to be linked to CRP2.	Expenditures by CGIAR Centers in CRP2 are determined during this phase of CRP2 development by each of the Centers based on their current budget and expenditures and their planned policy work under CRP2 over the planning period. IRRI, CIFOR and Africa Rice have not committed work and expenditures to CRP2. Policy linkage with these centers will be done through collaboration with their respective CRPs.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	<b>PART 4: COMMENTS FROM GFAR</b>	
<i>Subtheme 1.3</i>	No reference to the role of GFAR or the Regional Fora, none to the GCARD Roadmap. FAO not engaged.	This has been corrected; we have added references to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), and also the engagement with FAO and GFAR. We have in particular highlighted in several parts of Section 4 the important linkages and plans for collaboration with GFAR, Regional Fora, and the GCARD Roadmap.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
<b>PART 5: GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GENDER STRATEGY IN EACH CRP</b>		
<i>Gender</i>	1. The justification and rationale for the CRP should contain convincing and evidence-based arguments for addressing (or not) gender in the proposal. If gender is not addressed, the reasoning behind this decision should be made explicit.	The rationale for addressing gender is specified in the Rationale section (Section 1), drawing on considerable research by IFPRI, FAO SOFA, etc.
<i>Gender</i>	2. The description of the objectives of the CRP should include gender-responsive goals and objectives (quantified if possible). Such objectives take into consideration the different status, roles, needs, interests and preferences of men and women as farmers and consumers. The description of objectives should also clarify whether gender is a standalone component of the CRP's agenda (it undertakes strategic gender research) or it is a cross-cutting thematic area in which gender analysis is used to inform and deepen the relevance of other research themes. Researchable gender research questions should be identified that articulate the role of gender issues in the CRP.	Table 2.1 includes gender in the intermediate objectives. Key gender issues are identified in each subtheme; the strategic gender research program (Section 5) will work on development of methods and analysis cutting across subthemes.
<i>Gender</i>	3. The description of the impact pathways in the proposal should explicitly include gender dimensions, clarifying the type of partnerships needed for outcomes and impacts on women farmers and consumers to become a reality.	All three impact pathways include attention to gender dimensions, and the partnerships include gender studies units as well as women's organizations.
<i>Gender</i>	4. The description of the activities to be undertaken in the CRP should include an explanation of how gender analysis is going to be implemented and its results used throughout the cycle: priority research questions, design of the work, impact pathways and M&E (measuring the results of the work). Proposed activities to deliver on the gender-responsive goals and objectives should be described in the same level of details as the other research activities in the proposal.	The reviewers of CRP2 have noted that CRP2 is strong on integration of gender throughout all subthemes. This is because gender has been included in the priority-setting, and we are building a strong cadre of gender researchers to conduct the research. Including gender in the impact assessment of programs is a particular strength of CRP2 researchers.

Issues / Proposal section	Comments and suggestions	Proponents' response and changes made
	Gender-responsive research methods are expected to be used in such activities.	
<i>Gender</i>	5. The description of the M&E system used in the CRP should include a clear explanation of how progress toward the realization of the gender responsive goals and objectives is going to be measured and monitored. This should be done using relevant gender-responsive indicators. Proponents should also explain how the feedback from the M&E on gender analysis will be used to realign R&D priorities, the design of research activities, dissemination, the design of impact pathways and finally impact assessment.	Gender is included in the description of the overall impact assessment strategy, as well as in the detailed presentation of each subtheme.
<i>Gender</i>	6. The budget presentation and discussion in the CRP proposal should contain an explicit gender analysis component. The costs of the gender related activities proposed and the gender expertise needed to implement them, either through staffing, capacity building and/ or through collaborations, should be clearly spelled out, for each of the major partners.	There is clear provision for, and description of strategic gender research in Section 5, in addition to significant attention to gender within each of the subthemes. The strategic gender research has a specific budget line and additional gender research is included in the budgets of the other research themes as well.
<i>Gender</i>	7. The proposal should include the articulation of its gender strategy. This is a synthesis of the big picture goals and objectives for conducting gender analysis in the CRP and a recapitulation of the above points, emphasizing the means selected for implementing this gender strategy.	Section 5 lays out the gender strategy.