

Response to donor comments on the GRiSP Proposal

Issues/Proposal section	Reviewers' comments and suggestions	Proponents' response/ changes made
Fund Council July 15 meeting preliminary comments / BMGF Prabhu Pingali		
General	Workplan 2011-2015 and budget 2010-2013: not coherent	Workplan and budget now aligned to 5 years each
	Need milestones that are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)	All milestones have been revised
	More clarity on budget: provide different budget levels and show what you get for those levels	Three budget scenarios are provided and benefits from additional funding are clarified (marked milestones for that in the logframe)
	Funding gap graph: misleading and too pessimistic, needs revision	Graph has been removed.
	Budget needs to be tied to logframe, not clear how budget links with products	Budget has been built 'bottom-up' from product and product line level; details are available upon request
	Helpful to separate out genebank costs, how does MP lead to savings?	Genebanks for rice will be integrated more within GRiSP, leading to savings for long-term storage and conservation research. Genebank cost is not included in the GRiSP budget anymore.
	How will GRiSP engage with BRICs and devolve responsibilities?	A whole new section on BRICs has been added
	Gender: need to provide specific milestones related to women's participation in R&D process; not adequately resources in terms of people and funds	Gender chapter rewritten with more detail. Gender aspects are cross-cutting and present in all research themes, products and milestones. Within GRiSP we believe that we should look at gender from a research efficiency point of view; gender consideration will enhance the efficiency and impact of research. We have not attempted to make milestones 'gender specific', but many milestones do contain gender targets.
	Rice for BMGF is the system not the commodity; include diversification	This is also our view and this has been made clearer in the new version, especially in the introduction and the complete re-design of Theme 3.
Fund Council / EIARD		
General	Strongly support the iSPC comments on the GRiSP proposal, considering that these iSPC comments should serve as a guide to prepare a revised version of this research proposal.	The iSPC comments have been taken into account in revising this proposal, and a separate table is available indicating what changes were made

	The approach proposed is, or at least appears, insufficiently innovative as compared to pre-reform CGIAR research activities (because this innovativeness is either just not present or not visible enough).	We believe that there is a lot of innovation in GRiSP. There has never been a globally coordinate strategy for research on rice production systems, so that alone is a huge innovation. Moreover, each Theme description contains a section on innovations under that theme. We should also keep in mind however, that many ongoing activities need to continue and be strengthened because they are of high priority and have resulted from strategic planning and priority setting exercises done within the past 4 years, involving numerous stakeholders.
	ARIS from Brazil, China and India should be integrated as partners.	A whole new section on BRiCs and their roles has been added
	The budget should be revised, to respond to the initial Consortium Board recommendations to present different funding options, and to account for the necessity for the CGIAR Fund to support in 2011 (and subsequent years) not only one MP but the whole portfolio of SRF generated proposals.	We have completely revised the budget and now present three scenarios. This is the best we can do with the limited information available.
	Comments should be taken on board, in the revised proposal wherever possible and/or during implementation. The M&E plan needs further elaboration.	Chapter on M&E has been completely revised.
European Commission		
Strategic Coherence	Improve focus by expanding to consider rice-based farming systems. Current document appears as very "commodity" oriented, and not enough "farmers" oriented. Farming systems activities included in the proposal (product lines 3.5 and .3.6) need to gain more visibility/priority.	Theme 3 has been re-designed, with a stronger emphasis on the major rice-based farming systems (ecologies). GRiSP products will be developed and their dissemination facilitated within the context of rice-based farming systems.
	The boundary of GRiSP with MP 1 is not currently clear, and elucidation of this boundary and avoidance of duplication of activities is crucial. Similar risks exist at the boundaries with system-wide genetic resource conservation and information (<i>exactly how this will be handled can only determined after the consultancy that is to</i>	At the time of writing the GRiSP proposal, none of the other MPs was at the same level of detail, and it is, therefore, difficult to be precise about boundary issues between MPs. Deputy director generals of the CGIAR centers have planned a workshop in 2011 to look at boundary issues and avoidance of duplication. In the GRiSP proposal, anticipated collaboration with other MPs is discussed and three modes of

	<p><i>be launched shortly</i>), and with MP 7 – climate change, agriculture, and food security. Synergies, and potential overlaps also exist with other commodity based MPs – particularly the wheat MP, given the importance of the rice – wheat farming system in the Indo-Gangetic Plain.</p>	<p>collaboration are proposed. We have expanded that section by discussing in more detail interactions with MPs 5 and 7 and across a number of MPs through the CSISA regional initiative.</p>
	<p>Rice is a crop with a heavy water demand and there are environmental arguments against a programme based around rice as a commodity (as opposed to promoting it as part of an integrated farming system).</p>	<p>Rice is a crop that thrives in lowland areas where other crops cannot be cultivated. GRiSP will develop sustainable rice systems in rainfed lowland and irrigated areas, collaborating with MP5 on maintenance of ecosystem services and upstream-downstream issues. It is important to note that irrigated rice is the only crop that can be grown year-on-year without crop rotation. However, it is clear that water saving is important and implicitly dealt with in all product lines under Theme 3. Moreover, sustainably diversification of rice cropping systems as a key element of GRiSP research, in PL 3.2. and 6.2.</p>
	<p>In some countries, rice farmers are not among the poorest farmer groups. Although the GRiSP proposal mentions the issue of "equity", the ex ante assessment (pp72-75) fails to consider the risk of increasing social differentiation between rice producers. Will GRiSP increase the differences in competitiveness between rice producers (globally)? Will it be pushing some rice producers "out of business" (and what could then be their alternatives, in the agricultural or non agricultural sectors)?</p>	<p>We are living on a knife edge as far as rice production is concerned. In Asia, land and water resources are being taken out of production. Our first concern is to ensure that there will be enough rice to feed the world population and at affordable prices. Our ex-ante impact assessment of GRiSP has calculated benefits to both the rural and urban poor. Rather than pushing people out of jobs we believe that in many places stimulating rice production will create more jobs. For example in Africa, rice is often seen as an engine for economic growth, investing in rice means creating more jobs across the rice value chain and greater social equity.</p>
Financial soundness	<p>The total budget is inconsistent with the current budget envelope. Support the initial recommendations of the FC that GRiSP should come up with alternative scenarios based on reductions of 20% and 40%. This does not imply a restriction on GRiSP drawing on resources outside the CGIAR Fund if these are available. It would be interesting to know how any reduction in budget may affect priority setting. i.e. between regions, between rainfed rice and irrigated rice</p>	<p>In the new version of GRiSP three budget scenarios are presented:</p> <p>Scenario A: 2009 baseline funding + annual inflation adjustment (3%)</p> <p>Scenario B: 2010 baseline funding + annual inflation adjustment (3%) + global program support cost (new) + CGIAR system cost (2%);</p> <p>Scenario C: all of Scenario B plus an extra 5%/yr for research</p>

	<p>and between themes (noting that close to 50% of the total budget goes to themes 1 and 2, i.e. the genetic resources and breeding), and what would be the implications on the timeline of some activities.</p> <p>Given the relative importance of rice, particularly as a crop for small farmers, the geographical distribution of the current budget is about right. The proportion going to partners/ collaborators is slightly on the low side, but not unreasonable.</p>	<p>Of those, Scenario C is the one that is required for achieving the vision of success targets in GRiSP.</p>
Soundness of M&E Plan	<p>The M&E plan has not been worked out in any detail. While noting the intention to develop this at a workshop in 2011, presumably in a more participatory way that is possible at present, the absence of an M&E plan is a serious deficiency of the current document. It means that GRiSP does not comply with the proposed checklist of criteria for MPs, drawn up by the Consortium Board.</p>	<p>The M&E section in the document has been expanded. A workshop will be held in 2011 to improve this further.</p>
Degree of partnering	<p>GRiSP has an extensive network of partners covering a wide range of stakeholder groups. While examples are given of the role some of these partners play, the report might benefit from a more structured presentation of their role in different parts of the impact pathway.</p>	<p>The partnership chapter has been completely rewritten. It is clarified that GRiSP will work with Research partners (key partners directly involved in GRiSP research, usually through a collaborative agreement, and thus also accountable for certain GRiSP outputs), development partners (partners who are more indirectly involved in the research - local adapters - and/or play a significant role in the dissemination and adoption process - disseminators) and others (not directly involved in developing, adapting or disseminating GRiSP products, but in need of information on GRiSP and its outputs for various purposes). Different types of partners have been identified for each product line and this very detailed information is available upon request.</p> <p>An example has been developed for theme 6 for CIAT-FLAR.</p>
Netherlands		
Required changes	<p>The presented MP has not the virtues of MP's as proposed and thought of during the development of the CGIAR reform process. The</p>	<p>We believe that GRiSP fulfills all criteria for a CRP. It is based on a strong track record of past impact, has huge future impact potential, and provides an entirely new, truly global</p>

	<p>NL does not see the advantages, innovation or change in this MP compared to the conventional pre-reform Centres approach, including the lack of an analysis of the past adoption record related to the envisaged research (encompassing also the technology adoption aspect).</p>	<p>platform for innovations and partnerships.</p>
	<p>The development of this MP, and its presentation to the Consortium Board has followed an unusual procedure, by ignoring the Consortium Board's letter with an explicit request of amending the MP. The Consortium Board should therefore be in a position to neglect any MP proposal(s) for further processing, which do not adhere to their criteria. The Consortium Board was created exactly for this particular problem.</p> <p>Furthermore, with this sequence of events, the Fund Council was confronted with a situation, which it was not supposed to. The underlying difficulty in the chain of events so far regarding the submission of the GRiSP proposal is that this MP can be regarded as a MP, which is not sufficiently linked with the current version of the SRF. It is absolutely necessary to get an SRF adequately formulated/approved, which will be strong enough for the CGIAR system. Problems can be expected now with potential overlapping mandates between MP's in which rice-based systems feature.</p>	<p>Budget scenarios presented in this version of GRiSP are fully in line with guidelines provided by the CB.</p>
	<p>The budgetary allocations for the MP's are currently based on a "first come, first serve" basis, without acknowledging certain priorities in the sequencing of MP's. The more straightforward MP's or MP's with a head start have the advantage of forcing their way through the available funds, while other MP's defined and approved later in time, may therefore end up having to wait/delay their implementation path.</p>	<p>Budget allocation across the various CRPs are not for us to judge. In GRiSP, we have used a transparent process of priority setting in budgeting and we strive to have mechanisms in place that will ensure annual evidence-based adjustments. This is all described in great detail in the revised proposal.</p> <p>Please also note that in the initial stage GRiSP is still financed through 80% (existing) bilateral grants, i.e., we will not draw funds away from other centers or CRPs.</p>

	The sequencing of MP's currently has no relation with priority setting based on an approved version of the SRF.	
Recommended changes	The useful and worthwhile connection to involvement of advanced institutes and research organisations in B(R)IC countries have not been indicated. Not at least as equal partners, perhaps as so-called beneficiaries. Identify these linkages and map also the expected potential financing of these outside-CGIAR links. iISPC has identified this weakness in adequate terms.	Relationships with BRIC countries have been clarified in this new version.
	The GRiSP proposal sometimes sounds as if 40 years of research on rice-based systems and production technology has produced limited value for the farmers (see also the 2008 system-wide review). There is only scant analysis of and accounting for previous successes and failures in that area.	Introduction section rewritten to better account for past successes.
	This MP does not identify which blue-sky research would be needed (apart from the C4 and N-fixation work). Elaborate on this as this blue-sky research is to start shortly, in order to produce results in the medium-long term. The setup of a set of certain criteria by the iISPC to finance this (and future) blue-sky research will be very useful.	The proposal has now a chapter on exploratory 'blue sky' research and an increasing amount of funds will be dedicated to this type of research over the 5 budget years.
UK (DFID) [Philippe Petithuguenin]		
Projection of higher impacts	<p>The higher impact contribution should be projected clearly from the outset (executive summary) and recommend that these focus on specifying what are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific elements distinguishing this rice-based systems approach from the status quo • The value for money comparative advantages • The differences in building up a critical mass of knowledge, and the long term impacts of this on poverty reduction <p>There is room for including stronger statements</p>	Impact assessments have been strengthened and include Africa. The executive summary has been revised.

	about the convincing evidence of impact to cascade from the short-term 5 year outcomes and the 10 year longer term ones will emerge.	
Empowerment and capacity building	<p>The proposed capacity building strategy should integrate more focus on empowerment approaches which emphasise inclusive participation. There is need for more attention to engagement strategies for target groups to achieve greater ownership of national systems.</p> <p>The partnership approach involving theme leaders, product manager, partners is spelt out to a certain degree for the national level, and there is mention of stakeholder groups (dealers, women, rice farmers, seed producers etc) in parts of the proposal - Recommend that these and other end users, beneficiaries are spelt out more clearly in a sub-heading in the programme design chapter. The stakeholder analysis within the <i>ex-post</i> assessment should have more details to draw from.</p> <p>It is critical that the proposal be very clear about empowerment approaches - what are some of the proven or new measures for including and benefiting those who need meaningful changes in their lives; how will they be allowed to engage with the processes of generating new knowledge. These will of course be elaborated at the implementation stage, but a strong proposal statement of the a) target groups and end beneficiaries and b) the empowerment dimension towards concrete outcomes for the poor.</p>	<p>The proposal now places more emphasis on the inclusion of stakeholders in research, supportive capacity building and participatory learning and action research. ICRA has a partnership with Africa Rice specifically for strengthening participation at the local organization and farmer level. In South Asia it is proposed that the Training Centre with IRRI will give emphasis to such empowerment. It will draw on the lessons learned from PETRRA (it was an approach positively received by a wide wide of agencies from government institutions to local NGOs to farmers) and interact closely with the approaches being used by ICRA with AfricaRice. This is part of grassroots voice that is important for gender, business links and poverty focus and agency participation.</p>
Accountability	Civil society partners: there should be benchmarks and quality controls for ensuring the meaningful representation of the poorest by these civil society organizations at the village level, and inclusive engagement. These could be built into the arrangements for the grants to the	A large number of civil society partners are involved in GRiSP both as research partners, local adapters and to facilitate wide-scale dissemination. Such close links will ensure participatory learning and change, rapid and equitable out-scaling and early feedback on performance to research.

	<p>member centers. The log frames also need to pay attention to these. 'Social accountability' mechanisms, like the ones seen in Asia, are some of the approaches which can enhance transparency and promote learning and changes at the village level.</p>	
Poverty Analysis and M&E	<p>M&E section is a bit too succinct (page 44) and should specify the need for impact evaluation with a strong focus on poverty impact. Theme 5 focuses on providing feedback to other themes based on ex ante and ex post impact assessments. Poverty analysis using robust methodology should underpin the product lines and outputs of this theme, and the research approach for this theme should clearly state this. Is it worth having some degree of comparative analysis by region (e.g. partnership effectiveness, south-south learning, etc.)</p>	<p>The M&E section has been improved but will obtain further attention early on in 2011. We wish to develop a learning-oriented M&E system based on a set of common indicators that will enable identification of dead-end streets early and allow for quality feedback to research. In addition it should be noted that this also relates to the capacity building process that will create an action learning approach around poverty focus, women, partnerships etc. The M&E feeds back in to research and capacity building. See empowerment comments above. The system will also allow for accountability to donors on progress made.</p>
FAO [Narin Nichterlein on behalf of Anton Mangstl]		
Related to research topics	<p>Important topics such as the System of Rice Intensification (SRI), aerobic rice and conservation agriculture are not seriously reflected in the research programmes. SRI is not even mentioned, aerobic rice and conservation agriculture are not mentioned as productions system but only in the context of breeding.</p> <p>In view of the challenges rice is facing worldwide (GHG emissions, water consumption) and in view of the positive evidence existing on SRI and Conservation Agriculture for rice, it is strange that the rice research MP is not more seriously picking up these ideas to optimize rice cultivation under the given external pressures, for example given by the need for adapting to and mitigating climate change</p>	<p>More emphasis is paid to aerobic rice and conservation agriculture in the current version. Cropping systems research related to climate change is now captured more clearly in product lines 3.1-3.4.</p> <p>Scientific evidence for SRI is controversial. We have not seen convincing evidence that this is a truly novel management approach that leads to significant increases in productivity and resource use efficiency if compared to already known best management practices. It should not be seen as universal recipe because it will not fit into many socioeconomic and cropping systems settings. Moreover, the mega drivers in agriculture demand technologies that require less labor. Hence, in GRiSP our focus is on developing good agricultural practices in general, some of which may include elements of management practices that may also be part of SRI. .</p>

<p>Related to partnerships and with relevance to the impact pathways</p>	<p>It is important to stress integration of the MP on rice within ongoing national, regional and global initiatives and programmes that address food security such as NEPAD/CAADP investment compact, NPFS, RPSF, and GAFSP .</p> <p>Mentioning these among other relevant government initiatives would draw the attention to the need to ensure complementarity and articulation between relevant research- oriented initiatives and policy and decision making at countries' and regional levels. The reference should be grafted under partnership (page 44) to balance CGIAR and other research bodies, and to stress a new capacity to establish linkages with action oriented large scale-government initiatives.</p> <p>On major programme partners outside of the CGIAR and their roles (page 44, 45), while international donor organizations are included, international development organizations, such as FAO are not listed, that can assist to link research agenda with the development agenda of the countries through policy advice, standard setting, capacity development of rural institutions including extension services, farmer organizations , etc.</p>	<p>GRiSP will actively link up with national, regional and global rice development initiatives, especially through Theme 6. The partnership chapter has been updated, distinguishing research and development partners, including FAO.</p>
<p>Theme specific</p>	<p>Theme 5 has a section on partnerships that specifically mentions the need to bring in all stakeholders and FAO is mentioned as such in this context. Reference could/should also be made to a common effort for a coherent international approach for information and knowledge sharing in agricultural research in the context of the CIARD initiative, given that the CGIAR is a founder member. 2.</p> <p>Theme 6 reflects the need for a collaborative</p>	<p>These suggestions have been captured in the new version.</p>

	<p>multi-stakeholder approach, but mainly with national and regional partners, and this could be modified to reflect the need for international players acting at global level such as FAO.</p>	
JAPAN [Keiichi Sugita]		
<p>Global warming</p>	<p>Value the fact that GRiSP addresses, in the context of climate change not only adaptation but also reduction of global warming potential, and believe that research activities addressing these elements should be made more explicit in the logical framework.</p> <p>Below are examples for some amendments. By doing so, “Theme 3 also addresses management practices for reducing the global warming potential of rice fields” (p19 Box2) will be substantiated, thus explicit that GRiSP addresses not only adaptation but also mitigation to climate change, and moreover, that while focusing on increasing production, environmental aspect is also considered, making the MP more balanced.</p> <p>While it is clearly stated in the Rationale for Product line 3.4 (p138) that “the key research question is how the productivity... can be increased while simultaneously reducing negative externalities”, it should be easily found in the logical framework.</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <p>The approaches to reduce greenhouse gas emission (product 3.4.3)(p139) is difficult to find in the logical framework compared to adaptation (product 3.1.1)(p132), and so;</p> <p>(1) The title for product line 3.4 could be revised to include something like “intensive and sustainable (or environment-friendly)” <i>or</i></p> <p>While products 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 address cropping system options, 3.4.3 seems different (p138-139,</p>	<p>A separate product line has been created under Theme 3 dealing with climate change adaptation and mitigation from a cropping systems point of view.</p>

	152). Therefore, an alternative solution could be to relocate 3.4.3 to under product line 3.1 (technologies for an ecological intensification ...under current and future climates)(p132-133, 144), thus clustering technology development for adaptation and mitigation to climate change. (2) insert “(product 3.4.3)” (or “(product 3.1.x)”)after “...the global warming potential of rice fields” in Box2(p19)	
Integration with other MPs	P 49 states that GRiSP fully participates in MP5 (land, soil, water, ecosystem) and 7(climate change), and GRiSP feeds technologies and knowhow into these MPs. Need to better understand how and what kind of rice research activities from GRiSP will fit into other MPs and what kind of feedback is expected from those MPs. Nice if there is a concrete example.	At the time of writing the GRiSP proposal, none of the other MPs is at the same level of detail, and it is, therefore, difficult to be precise about boundary issues between MPs. Deputy director generals of the CGIAR centers have planned a workshop in 2011 to look at boundary issues and avoidance of duplication. In the GRiSP proposal, anticipated collaboration with other MPs is discussed and three modes of collaboration are proposed. We have added more discussion on interactions with other MPs.
CANADA [Catherine Coleman]		
Impact pathways	The impact pathways (pp. 39-40) are a bit too generic to understand exactly how the MP will achieve new international public goods. think this is really at the heart of the MP, and could be fleshed out more, e.g., aligned with the six interconnected research themes..	Impact pathways have been described in more detail and 8 concrete examples are now provided in the description of the product lines.
Partnerships	More clarity regarding partnerships, including the private sector (as discussed at the FC meeting in July), would be welcome, e.g., provide a general idea of roles and responsibilities.	Collaboration with the private sector is now better explained in the partnership chapter
Research Priorities	In transitioning to a broad programmatic perspective, it's not clear which activities/research areas will no longer continue (if any).	A steady-state budget scenario is presented and a scenario with a 5% / year growth in the research budget. Additional outputs that can be obtained through enhanced funding are indicated in the logframes.
Strategic environmental assessment	Recommend to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment, given the magnitude of the anticipated impacts as a result of	This type of research will be conducted in collaboration with MP7

	increased rice production, and current and future climate change.	
Budget	Both the FC and the Consortium have committed to not disadvantaging MPs that receive approval later on in terms of their prospects for funding. The investment gap noted in the proposal must be squared with the probable levels of resources from the new multi-donor trust fund and bilateral funds in the next few years, recognizing that new levels of funding will be needed (as noted on p. 64). CIDA supports the Consortium's work in this area to bring discipline and sound financial planning to the new programmatic approach, and we see an opportunity to sharpen the figures the FO is currently collecting to provide to the Consortium, which are more comprehensive and detailed than the previous data collection exercise re: funding forecasts. We would encourage IRRI to quantify, where possible, likely levels of co-investment by partners outside of the CG system.	Co-investments of the three key partners, Cirad, Ird and Jircas are roughly know, but will be quantified better in the future. The same applies to other co-investments.
Gender equality	Leadership: An early CGIAR Gender Program publication "From Field to Lab and Back: Women in Rice Farming Systems," documents some of the early practice and leadership in IRRI. While this publication does not indicate whether this leadership has continued to the present, it is hoped that IRRI's earlier leadership in this area is something that it can build upon.	We are happy that this approach is endorsed. The course in women's leadership has been run 8 times at IRRI for persons across the region. This year under STRASA a new model is being tested in training for women's leadership in which there is follow through with the Concept Notes prepared during the training. These will be women led. The milestones for GRiSP indicate women leadership development within research and grassroots organizations. Thelma Paris took over the leadership of the early CGIAR Gender Program. She is currently the Senior Scientist (socio-economist-gender specialist) who will take the lead of the gender strategy of GRiSP. She will work with gender focal points in CIAT and AfricaRice
	Programming: It is not clear whether the gender audit (p. 43) is the same thing as the broader scoping paper, or a separate piece; nor when the audit will be done. Sequencing of an audit is essential given GRiSP is going to the FC in	We will wait for the scoping study to see more clearly whether an additional gender audit is needed and how it will be done for GRiSP.

	<p>November for approval and most of the program and R&D details seem to be well-developed. It will be important for the GRiSP to clarify for the Board, the parameters of the gender audit, when it will take place, and how it will inform the program given how far along the GRiSP program appears to be.</p>	
	<p>Partnerships: One area where more could be done to advance gender equality considerations in relation to partnerships would be to explicitly outreach to women, women's cooperatives, and women's farmers associations, as well as UN organizations working on gender issues, such as UNIFEM, UNFPA. The UN and other partners being canvassed for the information gateway initiative should also be asked to provide research on women and gender issues in agriculture. Here, the knowledge of the FAO and IFPRI could be called upon as key sources of information. Suggest requesting this be added to the proposal.</p>	<p>We believe that we should look at gender from a research efficiency and impact focus. Due attention to gender will enable us to be more efficient and have greater impact. We, therefore, need to provide scientists and partners with the tools and methodologies to ensure that we consider gender issues across the R to D continuum and will source any knowledge available, including from FAO and IFPRI. An approach that has been used for advancing women participation has been to link with local organizations that have a strong gender focus. This was done under the PETRRA project in which NGOs with a strong focus on women were targeted for partnership. This approach also strengthened government institutions which may not be strong in women leadership. This is a proposed pathway under Theme 6. See also comments on leadership above.</p>
	<p>Integration with other Mega Programs: p. 48, While there is some language of how GRiSP will interact with other mega-programs, there is no detail in this respect with regard to how gender will be integrated within and among programs. It will be important that we continue to monitor this, and request each program to provide further detail on this, following the release of the scoping study.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
	<p>Program Management, pp. 51-60: Suggest substantive knowledge on gender equality issues in agricultural research be part of the TOR's for representatives on the over-sight committee. We would also encourage all of the other centre boards to include some capacity on GE issues. Issues of composition and gender balance of</p>	<p>Agreed and this has been specifically worded in the description of the OC.</p>

	<p>broader governance structures can also be monitored. In terms of regional oversight and linkages, ensure outreach to gender equality units or specialists within the key regional institutions outlined, p. 52.</p>	
	<p>Program Implementation and Coordination: While this is a useful set of TOR's for the gender focal points, what is assumed is that the gender focal points (appointed, and within the broader team) are all GE Specialists. Experience in a multitude of international organizations demonstrates this is almost always not the case with gender focal points in practice being the most junior women with the least amount of knowledge, experience and authority appointed. Thus, how will the GRiSP ensure this does not happen? What specific, GE sensitive capacity-building will occur to support the GRiSP GE focal points? As a suggestion, "Senior Gender Equality Specialists" should be recruited by IRRI, Africa Rice and CIAT, in order to ensure senior level capacity in each region and to support the GRiSP to achieve development effectiveness and gender equality results.</p>	<p>All three CG centers have already appointed experienced gender focal points, which will receive additional training if needed.</p>
	<p>Budgets: While the proposal does support women's leadership development activities, and the sensitization of extension workers, it would be important to monitor whether these activities are adequately funded? As before, R&D product lines (project proposals) do include some GE examples. However, on funding broadly, while there is the statement that gender activities not embedded in the themes will require additional human and financial resources, p. 56, and that as part of the global program support and coordination budget there will be a central fund for umbrella gender activities, to be managed by the Program Director, under the direction of the Program Planning and Management Team - in this regard, we would welcome a specific</p>	<p>A separate budget line is included under the global program support and coordination budget. This seems the most appropriate place given the cross-cutting nature of gender.</p>

	budget line (or sub-line) in the GRiSP budget for gender equality.	
	Strategic Planning and Impact Assessment: According to the proposal, p. 58, ex post impact assessment, including gender impact will be done (5.5 product line), although early adoption (product 5.1) where gender is a primary focus will also be provided. We would encourage product line 5.5 to also explicitly identify gender as one of the factors to be included in the ex post impact assessments.	Done
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (D. Bergvinson)		
Corrections on list of acronyms	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation... use '&' instead of 'and'	Done
p. 2, Exec summary, Obj 3, on 2035 target	What can we do in 5 years and what can be achieved in 10 years (2020 so it aligned with Rosegrant's reports on poverty and agriculture)? Reducing the number of poor by 15% seems rather modest over the next 25 years and is a goal that few of us will be around to be accountable.	We have now attempted to estimate what can be achieved in the next 10 years beside estimations for the next 25 years. We believe that reducing the number of poor by 15% is actually quite a huge achievement for GRiSP if this can be realized. It would cost only \$20 per poor person.
p. 3, Exec summary	Theme 2: Accelerating the development, delivery, and adoption of improved rice germplasm.	Done
p.4 Exec summary on the 450 active GRiSP partners	Mention should be given about how these partners contribute along the research and delivery continuum that is critical for large-scale impact. Our grants have emphasized the inclusion of 'boundary partners' - a term coined under IDRC's Outcome Mapping. This is an important consideration as you develop an impact pathway as well as offers GRiSP the connection/interaction with MP1 sub components, especially the humid tropics.	Done
p.11, Box 1, Fig.4	This is the period we are being asked to invest and yet the impacts are only coming from	Impact assessment redone.

	<p>submergence tolerance. We are in the process of releasing salt-tolerant and drought tolerant (intermediate) varieties for rainfed conditions and hybrids are taking off, especially in rainfed systems in India and China. This also points to the issue of BRIC countries and the roll they can play in accelerating the development and dissemination of technology to smallholder farmers. I don't believe we need to wait until 2016 for hybrids. Nor 2021 for DH for rice. If you want to increase the Net Present Value of research outputs then please include these and I think this curve will look much more impressive and exciting for investors so you can realize your 10% budget increase year-over-year.</p>	
p.12, 3 rd bullet point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “greater ability to align CGIAR research with that of other major players working on rice, involving strong national research systems and related international research organizations, such as CIRAD, IRD, and JIRCAS, that constitute a powerful voice to influence global rice policies”... 	Done
p.13 Vision of success, Lifting productivity and reducing poverty, by 2035	<p>What can be achieved by 2020? What will be achieved by the end of this 3-year funding cycle under GRiSP?</p>	Statement revised
p. 16 Program design, on how GRiSP will be implemented	<p>“an initial set of 32 global and regional R&D product lines (typically 3–8 product lines per theme), that is, families of products or deliverables that provide global or regional options for next, intermediate, and final users, based on understanding of the regional, subregional, and even local needs and impact pathway”.</p>	<p>The number of product lines was reduced to 26. Two budget scenarios are presented, one assuming steady state funding and one assuming an increase of 5% per year in research budget. Products associated with a 5% budget increase have been identified in the logframes. More re-allocation of resources is program into the annual budgeting process, utilizing new information becoming available from the strategic assessment processes. The first such re-allocation is planned for early 2011 already.</p>

	<p>“milestones that provide measurable targets for each product and its uptake” (These need to be revised so they are SMART: strategic, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely. I found it hard to see milestones from BMGF projects that account for nearly 1/3 of IRRI's budget. It would be nice to see a few clear milestones pulled out from these grants and dropped into your logframe so we have the ability to eventually fund MPs directly).</p>	<p>Milestones in a program as large as GRiSP necessarily has to integrate milestones from projects. Links between project milestones such as those funded by BMGF and GRiSP milestones are clear and available upon request.</p>
p.18 on Theme 5	<p>It would have been nice to see this front and center in the new strategy to accelerate technology development by targeting needs. This is where social scientists should be working more closely with breeders (and vice versa) so the whole team can celebrate successes earlier than past R&D efforts. Have a look at the outline for MAIZE. How will MP1 be involved here? Not much mention of this interaction is given.</p>	<p>Product line 5.1 will be key in targeting research needs and this is now more visible throughout the proposal.</p>
p.18 on Theme 6	<p>What incentives are in place to foster an interdisciplinary approach?</p>	<p>Theme 6 will require the establishment of a pool of extension agronomists, such as already in place at AfricaRice who will use an inter-disciplinary approach.</p>
p.21 on product lines for Theme 1	<p>This might be a good opportunity to prioritize these outputs in case funding is not sufficient to do everything.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
p.46 on partnerships	<p>STRASA and CSISA engaged and embraced boundary partners early to facilitate dissemination of technologies. This key point is not captured in the narrative.</p>	<p>This has been rectified</p>
p. 54 on program management	<p>Here you might mention the incorporation of key milestones from these grants into the GRiSP logframe to facilitate the transition from bilateral to MP-targeted funding that over time will reduce financial and technical reporting requirements.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

p.59 on potential risks under Theme 2	Demand-driven - you can develop products but if farmers and consumers don't want them then impact will not be achieved.	Noted
p.59 on potential risks under Theme 4	Questionable. I agree with the ISPC comments on this.	This type of work will be mostly done by Cirad and partners. At present, investments in that area are low.
p.72 on adoption of technologies	This is obviously an area which needs innovation and ITCs are well placed to deliver that solution. I see very little (no) mention of this in GRiSP. We are trying to address this in CSISA.	We have now identified a separate product line under Theme 6 to address this issue
p.80 on PL 1.2	These techniques exist but it will be important to have a database management strategy in place to handle the terabytes of marker data that will be generated. High throughput genotyping will likely be best achieved using commercial providers through GIBS.	Agreed
p.90 on theme 1 milestones	Most of these milestones are quantitative and SMART but <u>some</u> are not. Including key milestones from STRASA, CSISA, C4 Rice, Harvest Plus would give BMGF more confidence to direct funding to GRiSP instead of bilateral projects. Achim has made a good first attempt at this but milestones can be sharpened over time as projects advance and renewals submitted for funding - STRASA would be a good place to start - especially under theme 2.	Milestones have been sharpened and one-to-one tables linking GRiSP milestones with project milestones are available
p. 115 on financing strat for hybrid rice	How does GSR and China, in general, feature here, given their leadership in hybrid rice research and seed production?	Input from China clarified under the partnership chapter.