

CGIAR Fund Council

July 6-8, 2011

Washington D.C., USA

Meeting Summary



CGIAR Fund Office

August 18, 2011

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

The CGIAR Fund Council (FC) met in Washington D.C., USA on July 6-8, 2011. Fund Council Chair Inger Andersen opened the meeting. She welcomed new Fund Donor representatives attending the FC meeting (FC5) for the first time. They were: Peter Bieler (Switzerland), Jean-Louis Chomel (European Commission), Tanaka Kenichiro (Japan), Xiangjun Yao (FAO), and Ibrahim Hamdan (AARINENA).

Catherine Coleman (Canada) was elected Co-chair of the meeting.

Canada requested that a discussion on gender equality be added under Agenda Item 16 (Other Business).

The provisional agenda was adopted as amended.

[Note: The FC5 agenda did not include presentations of reports from the Fund Office, Trustee and Consortium. Instead, written reports from these offices were provided as part of the documentation for the Council's information. No comments were raised on the three reports.]

Agenda Item 2. 2010 Financial Results and 2011 Financial Status Update

Gordon MacNeil, Director of Finance and Corporate Services at the Consortium Office, presented the 2010 financial results as well as an update of the 2011 financial status.

On the 2010 financial results, he highlighted the following: 1) External financing growth was 10% overall with significant increase in restricted funding; 2) Unrestricted funds, earned income, and restricted funds amounted to \$200 million, \$23 million, and \$445 million, respectively; 3) With total expenditure of \$629 million, an operating surplus of \$39 million was realized; and 4) the Centers had a total year-end reserves of \$314 million representing 4.5 months of expenses.

The second part of the presentation was on 2011 financing. Based on figures presented (Jan-June approved CRP budgets, stability financing, estimates of CRP Bilateral Funding, and Fund resource (Windows 1 & 2) requirements), he made the following observations: 1) All of the increase in year 1 CRP budgets is in Windows 1 and 2. Centers forecast almost perfectly the Bilateral Funding levels for that year; 2) The total CRP requirement of \$805 million in year 1 is an increase of 21% over total Center income in 2010 (Fund Donor grants plus earned income); 3) "Funding gaps", i.e. the difference between known/highly probable levels of income and the budgeted amounts in the CRPs – are variable and will probably change throughout 2011. More precision will be evident by the time of the 2012 financing plan submission; 4) Most growth scenarios budgets start to grow in year 2; and 5) Budgets for certain CRPs may yet change as some remain under development and some may be revised in the refinement process. He further pointed out that knowing what will be available in W1 & W2 is critically important; cash flow is a concern but a bigger concern is uncertainty. [Gordon MacNeil's PowerPoint presentation is available on the FC5 meeting web site at: http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/5th_fund_council_meeting]

The Chair decided that since Agenda Items 2 and 3 were linked, a more meaningful discussion would ensue by discussing the two items together.

Agenda Item 3. Cash Flow Projection

The Trustee representative, Ms. Priya Basu, Manager in the Multilateral Trusteeship and Innovative Financing unit (CFPMI), World Bank, provided a brief overview of financial management in the CGIAR including financial management 'tools' that are the most important to managing the CGIAR Fund resources. Ms. Basu also discussed the key long and short-term financial challenges faced by the CGIAR Fund.

She continued the presentation with the analysis of three cash flow scenarios, based on projected Fund Donor contributions to the CGIAR Fund for the period 2011 to 2013 and current estimates of the number and value of CRP approvals and System Costs up to 2013.

The first two scenarios illustrated the importance of receiving donor inflows in advance of the disbursement needs of Centers. The third scenario illustrated the additional donor funding required and the timing of these donor payments in order to meet projected disbursement requirements from Windows 1 and 2 for all 16 programs (including Genebanks) over the next three years.

- Scenario 1, based on all 16 CRPs being approved by December 2011, CGIAR Fund would start facing a disbursement challenge in February 2012; projected funding gap would reach approximately US\$100 million by December 2012;
- Scenario 2, did not change the assumption of 16 CRPs being approved by December 2011, however, it delayed the disbursement start date for the 7 CRPs that were up for Fund Council decision, to October 2011, instead of August 2011; projected funding gap would be a little under US\$100m by December 2012 ;
- Scenario 3, for purposes of illustration, this scenario showed that if additional donor inflows amounting to US\$ 566 million are received into the CGIAR Fund, projected disbursements between 2011 and 2014 could be met.

The Trustee further proposed an action plan for the short term to address the critical and immediate disbursement requests. It requires FC-led as well as Consortium-led actions.

For FC-led actions, the Trustee proposed mobilization of Fund Donor contributions by March 2012 in order to fix immediate disbursement shortfalls, expected to begin in 2012.

On Consortium-led actions, the Trustee proposed preparation of a financial plan aligned with a realistic approved financing envelope, taking into account priorities of the Consortium, rescheduling the disbursement amount of CRPs to align with the projected inflows and economizing and prioritizing on CRP budgets.

The long-term action plan focused on addressing the longer term financial sustainability of the Fund with the following actions to be considered by Fund Council:

- increasing the predictability, adequacy and reliability of the flow of funds would entail shifting more overall funding to Windows 1 and 2;
- developing and implementing a resource mobilization strategy which involves convening a regular Fund Donor meeting ;
- shifting to multi-year Contribution Agreements from Fund Donors;
- making use of promissory notes or letters of credit to facilitate commitment to fund CRPs without impacting the cash outlays of Fund Donors;

- building up a prudent liquidity level that ensures a liquidity cushion within the CGIAR Fund of a minimum of three months of disbursement requirements and can meet any unforeseen demand; this would involve front loading Fund Donor cash payments in the early years of the Fund.
- taking steps to monitor the accuracy of the projected Fund Donor transfers that would enable better assessment of the future funding status of the CGIAR Fund; and
- focusing on clear metrics to measure performance and efficiency to respond to Fund Donor demand for better value for money.

[Trustee's PowerPoint presentation is available at the FC5 meeting web site at:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/5th_fund_council_meeting]

Discussion:

- On the question to the Consortium Finance Director on what portion of the additional funding request in future years is aspirational versus a real budgeting number based on CRP priorities, it was clarified that the funding request figures show a 10% increase year over year, which is not an unreasonable increase.
- On the question that a primary focus of the reform was to counter the historical trend which indicates that Bilateral Funding will increase in future years and Centers will continue to operate on that assumption, it was clarified that the Consortium and the Centers would be delighted if Bilateral Funding was instead steered through Window 2 as Window 2 contains less conditionality than Bilateral Funding and would be simpler to administer and report on. The point being made was that Centers are good at fund raising and will continue to find the resources required to fund CRPs.
- On the Trustee's presentation, a question was raised whether not having good projections for Bilateral Funding, specifically in the out years, implies a greater draw on Windows 1 and 2, thus making the situation appear worse than it actually is. It was clarified that, as the Trustee did not have data on Bilateral Funding to the Centers, the numbers in the disbursement tables reflect only Windows 1 and 2 responsibilities in terms of CRP requests.
- Some members cautioned about being realistic regarding what can be delivered in terms of additional funding in the very short term; hence suggestions were made to look at the portfolio of research to ascertain what fits, what is congruent, cohesive and leverages highest value. In the process, implementation of components that are not of high priority can be delayed.
- Members felt that it was not the best use of Center Directors General or Center scientists' time to lobby for funds, particularly as they would lobby for Bilateral Funding.
- A member mentioned that it is not possible for his organization to enter into a funding mechanism that requires the use of promissory notes, letters of credit or multi-year commitments.
- Members commented that care should be taken not to lose momentum that has built up from the extensive work done in preparing CRP proposals, and the recalculation of budgets should not lead to redirection of funds that had been directed to specific priorities within a CRP.

Conclusions:

- *Members were not willing to delay the approval of CRPs or delay disbursements for some CRPs in relation to others.*
- *The Fund Office and Trustee will co-author a note on modalities for multi-year funding to be discussed in a Donors' Meeting.*

- *The abovementioned Fund Donors' Meeting which will be organized by the Fund Office in 2012 is aimed at reaching agreement on improved predictability and funding volumes and setting a realistic financing envelope up to 2013. The Consortium Board is supportive of convening such meeting and interested in participating in it.*
- *If a funding shortfall becomes apparent, the Consortium Board in consultation with the ISPC will work together with the Lead Centers and determine priorities that will allow the programs to move forward within the funding envelope.*

Agenda Item 4. Brainstorming Session

The Chair framed the brainstorming session on obtaining greater system-wide efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and doing more with less. She emphasized that no particular component of the CGIAR System was being targeted, but the intention was to make sure that all components of the CGIAR are efficient, effective, streamlined and have quality indicators for tracking efficiency gains.

Discussion:

- Some CRPs show a separate budget for management costs and others do not. The same observation was made on system costs.
- Members commented that efficiency gains could quite easily be achieved in those areas that have a number of Centers clustered within a given location. Each Center has its own administrative and IT systems as well as independent service units. Pooling of such resources would immediately result in cost savings and efficiency gains.
- Members felt that the Consortium or the Centers need to come up with benchmarking that will track efficiency gains and is included in the monitoring and evaluation and impact assessment arrangements.
- Efficiency in the sense of direct and indirect costs requires clear metrics and a robust and clear financial reporting system. It is critical to have clear guidelines on how overheads are classified and reported on.
- A suggestion was made to undertake an analysis similar to the one done on Genebanks to clearly define management costs, overheads or admin costs and whether they are applied in similar ways and if not, create a metric that shows where savings could be achieved. The focus at the moment needs to be on moving the CRPs forward; however, this is an essential task to be carried out.
- Pooling of resources could also be considered for a wider agriculture and research for development architecture, where all the major players such as the Centers, GFAR and educational institutions ensure complementarity of effort, linkages and collaboration that will reduce transaction costs and lead to desired research impact.
- One of the important outcomes of the reform process was achieving tangible efficiency gains within the CGIAR. Efficiency gains will come from clarifying which activities Centers will stop doing over the next few years, which could lead to a different architecture of Centers.
- Similar efficiency gains can be achieved in ensuring CRP activities are high priority, with the ISPC playing a continuing role in defining the science priorities in conjunction with the Consortium.
- Members requested further details on the One Corporate System, and envisage it resulting in efficiency gains across the CGIAR.
- Some Fund Donors highlighted the fact that their organizations limited any indirect costs on their funding at 15% or lower, and this includes the 2% cost-sharing percentage (CSP) on

contributions through the CGIAR Fund. One of the reasons for this policy is to increase aid efficiency.

- It was pointed out that some CRP administrative costs range from 5% to 25% of the budget. There was insufficient information to make an assessment whether this was appropriate. It was felt this comparison could be achieved better after all CRPs have been approved and there are relevant data available to make such a comparison.
- The one-off efficiency gain from going from 15 Centers to a Consortium and from CGIAR membership assembly to Fund Council was pointed out, although at the moment there are no quantitative data to show this gain.
- It was pointed out that efficiency gains required a clear line of accountability and instruments to enforce efficiency. Within the CGIAR there are very limited incentives to drive down unit costs within the Centers. Defining an incentive mechanism for Centers would be important to drive efficiency gains.
- Some members felt that it is too early in the reform process to expect efficiency gains. New structures have been added, old projects have not yet been phased out, and the transition is not complete. Once clear metrics to measure efficiency are developed, clear lines of accountability, put in place, a clear system of funding is established with norms for management of funds, and a an incentive structure is in place, efficiency gains will follow.

The Consortium provided an overview of the efforts made to streamline processes and gain efficiencies from services such as the One Corporate System and Easy CRP. Some highlights were:

- Discussions should focus on identification on areas of efficiency gains in the entire CGIAR with clear and measurable indicators and appropriate benchmarking for efficiency gains for all components of the CGIAR.
- Once the budgets and work plans of certain bodies that make up part of System Costs, i.e. the ISPC, Consortium Office, and Fund Office, are submitted later in the year, and subjected to a peer review, a much better overall view of efficiency gains will emerge.
- The discussion is biased towards efficiency gains as reduction of administrative costs. Through the reform process efficiency gains can also be derived from raising productivity, enhancing value for money, getting greater impact on the four SLOs that have been identified, getting greater outputs or improved quality for the same inputs etc. These aspects have been ignored or not given the consideration they deserve.
- It is too early to declare quantitative evidence of real gains, especially financial gains until implementation of the reform is complete, and until the system runs smoothly. At the moment there are additional transaction costs and governance structures rather than a streamlined process. Some additional costs were required in the short term to bring about efficiency in the longer term. This process in similar organizations is a long-term process and change happened in phases over an extended period.
- The Consortium's focus on efficiency gains is around what is mission critical to research and to the shift from Center focus to programmatic activity.
- Consortium needs time and space and trust to be able to lay the foundations required to make those changes and to be able to put into place building blocks that would enable that to happen.
- On the question of accountability, the Consortium believes that accountability does go through the CRPs themselves and that is the channel of accountability from the Consortium to the Centers/CRPs.
- There is no one size fits all governance structure. The Consortium continues to work on governance issues between the Consortium and the Member Centers - that is work in

progress. Each of the CRPs is unique and has its own set of requirements. The Consortium continues to look at ways to align the CRPs as closely as possible; however, it is important that the Lead Center is allowed to work through this process. The Consortium Board continues to provide guidance and look for synergies between CRPs.

- The Fund Council was reminded by the Consortium that the 15 Centers of the Consortium continue to have their own governance structure but now act in a ‘federation’, united around a common vision. Changing to collective and central action takes time, and does not always equate to efficiency gains.

Conclusions:

- *Consortium CEO and Fund Council Executive Secretary will develop together a metric to measure efficiencies in terms of money, productivity, outputs etc. in each of the CGIAR units.*
- *Consortium will report at the next Fund Council meeting (FC6) on the progress of the One Corporate System.*

Agenda Item 5. CRP3.1 proposal: WHEAT – Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-Poor in the Developing World

The CRP3.1 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by CIMMYT (the Lead Center) at the last Fund Council Meeting (FC4) in Montpellier.

Ken Cassman, ISPC Chair, reminded the Fund Council that all CRP proposals were reviewed by a common set of criteria agreed by the Consortium Board and ISPC. He then gave a summary of the ISPC’s written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended the proposal be “approved subject to revisions” taking into account the points emphasized in the detailed commentary.

Discussion:

Some FC members have previously shared written comments. The following additional points were made at the meeting:

- The goals seem modest especially for 2020; the bar should be raised.
- Budget allocation should consider the question of what would it take to stimulate and support effective partnerships.
- Implementation of gender framework is where programs are falling short; Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) should reflect gender to address it adequately.
- There should be scope to create synergies with programs that are still being developed, e.g. Support to Agricultural Research for Development on Strategic Commodities in Africa (SARD-SC)
- Clearly identify which research activities would lead to the expected impact.
- SI 10 (capacity building) is more on the development part of the ‘research for development’ continuum.
- Relationship between International Research Initiative in Wheat Improvement (IRIWI) and the WHEAT Program should be specified and elaborated in the document. It was clarified that IRIWI is not focused only in developed countries.
- A case was made that the program’s involvement in the development of the seed systems is important.
- A closer look at management issues should be taken (a point that covers all CRPs).
- CIMMYT’s and ICARDA’s wheat programs need to be more integrated.

Tom Lumpkin (Director General) and Marianne Bänziger (Deputy Director General) of CIMMYT responded to a number of comments made by ISPC. They pointed out that the following changes have been made in the proposal since its presentation at FC4: 1) clarification of how WHEAT capitalizes on research in advanced economies and further information about the comparative advantage of the proposed program; 2) addressing perceptions about global wheat supply and its relevance for the poor; 3) clarifying that the CRP is about comparative advantage and price risk management and social stability of major wheat consuming countries in the developing world; 4) improved alignment of milestones, outputs and outcomes and clearer impact assumptions; 5) clarifying roles and responsibilities in the oversight & management section; and 6) including the full budget.

In response to some of the comments from FC members, the Lead Center’s representatives pointed out the following:

- IRIWI is an undertaking that is focused on wheat genomics; the WHEAT program would appreciate any help that it could get in that area.
- A new Table 2 showing prioritization among regions is included.
- There is scope for collaboration with upcoming regional research programs on wheat.
- Budget change in socio-economics work
- Capacity building is in-service training; it is not a stand-alone component
- Management review across the CRPs would be welcome;
- Greater alignment and integration of CIMMYT and ICARDA programs would be realized in the first 2 to 3 years of WHEAT.

Proposed Budget of CRP3.1:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	40.967	12.995	13.645	14.327
Window 3 & Bilateral	104.918	36.948	38.432	29.538
Sub-Total	145.885	49.943	52.077	43.865
Expanded Component	114.623	-	-	-
Total	260.508	-	-	-

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to CIMMYT and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP3.1 proposal.*
- *Broad support for the proposal was expressed by FC members taking into consideration ISPC’s commentary.*
- *The FC Chair complimented the proponents for being pro-active in preparing a revised draft.*
- *FC’s decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14.*

Agenda Item 6. CRP1.3 Proposal: Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable

The CRP1.3 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by WorldFish (the Lead Center) at the last Fund Council Meeting (FC4) in Montpellier.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that "the CRP 1.3 approach be approved to allow the program's proponents to engage with partners so as to develop a revised proposal and work plan with greater specificity, taking into account the advice/points contained in the commentary."

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- Recognition of ISPC's consideration of the objectives of the reform in addition to quality of the design in assessing the proposal.
- Need for more clarity on how the proposed program builds on previous research.
- How the CRP will address the institutional and political set up and dynamic influence in the access and benefit sharing arrangement of the resource available at the community level and beyond needs to be better explained.
- Partnership was emphasized as a critical factor in a successful systems approach, particularly in the context of impact and uptake pathway.
- Need for specificity about the contribution of Partners.
- ISPC's concerns about how the outputs of CRP1.3 will be utilized to maximize the international public good (IPG) benefits across countries were shared by a number of FC members. However, it was pointed out that there are alternative ways of looking at IPGs beyond scaling up opportunities. While not disagreeing with this, the ISPC Chair emphasized the need for the CRPs to set up in advance how they are going to go after the IPGs and how they will be communicated.
- Another member emphasized the critical importance of being able to set up a robust methodology that enables the generation of evidence which is more relevant than what can be generated by the program. The research-for-development (R4D) question hinges on a methodology that is sufficiently established to assess the quality of evidence being generated.
- The Chair pointed out that we have to ensure some generic lessons and research results that can be rolled out and tracked at a broader level; we are tending to have more open research questions early on to have to ensure the baselines are defined and have those as part of the results matrix and performance agreement

Stephen Hall, Director General of WorldFish, responded to some of the comments of the ISPC, pointing out among other things that: mechanisms will be in place for quality assurance (i.e. part of the CRP's governance and management bodies' responsibility, program implementation agreement, and M&E); the position of the CGIAR and the Centers involved as research organizations will not be compromised by political advisory work; other Centers' engagement is strong; and that the risks, including those that relate to the issue of management cost, are manageable.

In response to some comments from FC members, he pointed out the following: 1) his agreement to the observation that the IPG concept has many distinct dimensions, and a challenge is how to structure intervention and engagement for learning; 2) his role as Director General of WorldFish is not in management of the CRP but in contributing to the provision of oversight as a member (not chair) of the program's oversight panel; 3) the specific roles of Partners will be elaborated more as the program works out the process in the initial year.

Proposed Budget of CRP1.3:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	32.273	8.882	10.598	12.793
Window 3 & Bilateral	27.147	8.419	9.157	9.571
Total	59.420	17.301	19.755	22.364

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to WorldFish and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP1.3 proposal.*
- *Broad support for the proposal was expressed by FC members taking into consideration ISPC's commentary.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14.*

Agenda Item 7. CRP5 Proposal: Water, Land and Ecosystems

The CRP5 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by IWMI (the Lead Center) at the last Fund Council Meeting (FC4) in Montpellier.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the proposal be "substantially revised and re-submitted with particular emphasis given to the main points" raised in the commentary.

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- It is important that the CRP proposal be strategic and well structured, with priorities and areas of CGIAR comparative advantage clearly identified.
- The proposal should present a coherent program and not just a set of eight strategic research portfolios built around existing research activities. It needs to capture synergies between the rainfed and basins research portfolios.
- The proposal is fairly weak in identifying some key soil-related constraints, in its treatment of drip and sprinkler irrigation, on the potential of land use planning, and in explaining how the rural poor may potentially benefit as suppliers of ecosystem services.
- Proposal should explain how the Challenge Program on Water and Food will be integrated into the CRP.
- Clarify how far the CRP intends to go into researching land and water rights issues which are highly political and controversial issues.
- The issues concerning trans-boundary water management are important and it is suggested that they be elaborated further.
- There is a need to articulate quantitative outcomes of component research activities.
- Agreement with ISPC was voiced on the need to do a comprehensive planning of sentinel sites not only in this CRP but across all CRPs that intend to establish them.
- The proposal needs to clearly identify the risks and include more discussion on mitigating measures.
- Role of national partners should be clearly specified.

- Section on partnership needs sharpening; elaborate further on how to deliver the effectiveness on the partnerships.
- Links not only with the natural resource management CRPs but also integration with commodity CRPs should be highlighted and elaborated.

Colin Chartres, Director General of IWMI, indicated that the CRP5 proponents do not disagree with the points made by the ISPC in its commentary on the proposal, and have in fact started addressing some of the comments and suggestions. He highlighted the answers to the big question of what is new, i.e. 1) better partnerships across all Centers, better focus and prioritization, more focus on impacts; 2) addressing big questions; and 3) new solutions for old problems. He also cited specific changes that are being made in response to the comments received, namely, mainstreaming ecosystem services; nested portfolio with unified irrigation theme (surface and groundwater) and rainfed/pastoral themes merged; emphasis on the new rather than existing projects; focus on prioritization and partner interaction; and the merger of the Science and Impact Advisory Council with the Steering Committee.

He agreed with what the FC members raised in terms of elaborating in the proposal the hypotheses that have been developed, the planning of sentinel sites, linkages with other Centers/CRPs, alignment with national and regional programs/framework (e.g. CAADP), trans-boundary water management, etc. Those will be taken on board in the revised version of the proposal.

Proposed Budget of CRP5:

	(in \$ million)					
	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Windows 1&2	334.933	42.254	54.580	68.120	81.556	88.423
Window 3 & Bilateral	144.482	48.587	41.196	32.459	12.010	10.230
Sub-Total	479.415	90.841	95.776	100.579	93.566	98.653
Expanded component	90.569	-	-	-	-	-
Total	569.984	-	-	-	-	-

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to IWMI and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP5 proposal.*
- *There was broad agreement with ISPC's comments and suggestions on the proposal.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14.*

Agenda Item 8. CRP3.7 Proposal: More Meat, Milk and Fish by and for the Poor

The CRP3.7 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by ILRI (the Lead Center) at the last Fund Council Meeting (FC4) in Montpellier.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the proposal be "accepted with some revisions". It pointed out that the proposal has "good integration of the natural and social sciences with focus on a limited number of value chains. It further noted that the proposal is "promising in terms of delivery of local and regional impact, but creates risks in terms of delivering IPGs."

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- The value chain approach is appreciated; it gives more coherence and greater clarity to the program. Articulation of why particular value chains were selected and in the context of the region (not country) is suggested.
- Elaborate how the program will contribute to the production of IPGs and how small farmers and poor rural household will effectively benefit from the CRP.
- Consider the impacts of livestock and fish production on the environment in regard to greenhouse gases emissions (contribution to climate change), environmental contamination, land use changes and competition between food and feed.
- CRP3.7 should put the interaction between livestock (particularly small ruminants) and environment at its core.
- On animal health, the CRP should consider increasing partnership with other organizations, like OIE and the FAO, and with the private sector.
- Zoonotic and trans-boundary livestock diseases need to be given critical attention.
- The exclusion of small scale poultry production as regards public health concerns (e.g. avian flu) should be revisited.

In his response to ISPC's comments, Carlos Sere, Director General of ILRI, indicated that the CRP3.7 team had taken most of the ISPC comments on board and that they would be addressed in the implementation plan. Focusing on the issue of upstream research vs. value chain approach, he pointed out the team's view that the immediate trigger of change is the value chain work. As that system expands, there will be increasing technology demands and new issues arise, which become the subject of strategic research. The CGIAR has a key role in such types of research and should invest in them. On the question of IPGs coming out of the proposed program, it is the proponents' view that good research has to be anchored in real conditions. With limited number of locations and with appropriate research design, it should generate IPGs.

In his response to some of the comments from FC members, he pointed out that CRP3.7 is not the only CRP that deals with livestock; the issue around pastoralism, for instance, is being addressed in CRP1.1 (Dryland Systems); the issues concerning the impact of livestock on climate change are being addressed in CRP7 where ILRI is the largest partner Center, etc. On poultry, one of the entry points that could meet the IPG criterion may be the development of vaccines. On partnership with OIE and FAO, he noted that they are normative organizations and not engaged in research. On suggestions to include other issues, he suggested that the CRP look at them in the formulation of the operational plan after approval. However, he also emphasized that a key strength of CRP3.7 is its focus; other issues will need to be covered by other programs or research organizations.

Proposed Budget of CRP3.7:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1 and 2	35.183	10.333	11.881	12.969
Window 3 & Bilateral	64.400	19.397	21.909	23.094
Sub-Total	99.583	29.730	33.790	36.063
Expanded Component	20.125	-	-	-
Total	119.708	-	-	-

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to ILRI and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP3.7 proposal.*
- *Broad support for the proposal was expressed by FC members taking into consideration ISPC's commentary.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14*

Agenda Item 9. Report on the Establishment of CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement

The IEA Design team has prepared a report with 7 recommendations on the establishment of a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) for discussion and decision by the FC. The Executive Secretary introduced the item by briefly describing the recommendations submitted by the Design Team. He also indicated to the FC that the Lead Consultant of the Design Team, John Markie, was on stand-by and would be happy to answer questions through audio-conference, if requested.

Discussion:

The Fund Council's discussion centered on recommendations 1-5:

Recommendation 1: Single Independent Evaluation Office

- FC members expressed support for the recommendation to have one single independent evaluation office rather than an evaluation function that would be split between the IEA and the Consortium
- The interface of the IEA with the Consortium Office and ISPC/SPIA are vague and must be made clearer
- The development of the IEA is critical to engage end-users of research outputs in the evaluation process

Recommendation 2: Evaluation Staffing

- Staffing size of the IEA must be lean and evaluations should be commissioned to external consultants
- The IEA should start with 2-3 people initially and may further develop as its work program develops in the coming years
- Need to put mechanisms in place to avoid any tendency of bureaucratic, self-induced growth over time
- Need to stay open-minded on whether the head of IEA is hired full-time or part-time; most important is to recruit a competent person with a track record both in evaluation and research

Recommendation 3: Location

- FC members expressed support for the recommendation to have the IEA based in Rome for the reasons stated in the report. In particular, the FC would like to see a housing of IEA within FAO that is in close physical proximity to the ISPC Secretariat. The expectation is that a co-location will facilitate interaction and thereby enhance knowledge exchange and organizational learning from evaluation.
- While supporting the Rome location some FC members noted the need to be attentive to cost and administrative matters that require some openness to the final selection of the location.

Recommendation 4: Unified Rolling Evaluation Work Plan

- The FC members broadly agreed with the recommendation to have a unified evaluation work plan for the CGIAR as a whole.

Recommendation 5: IEA Budget

- The budgeting process needs further evaluation and it may be premature to decide on the IEA Budget at this stage
- Matching grants for financing CRP component evaluations appeared reasonable to some FC members; however, splitting the budgets for CRP component evaluations may introduce complexity in decision making;
- Cost of the CRP component evaluations should be budgeted within the CRP operations plan.

Decisions:

On Recommendation 1 – Structure

- *The FC accepts the recommendation for establishing one single entity responsible for independent evaluation in the CGIAR. The entity will be named “Independent Evaluation Arrangement” (IEA) and not “Independent Evaluation Arrangement Office”.*
- *The IEA will be reporting to the CGIAR Fund Council, while closely consulting with the Consortium. Among its responsibilities are the commissioning of CGIAR system-level evaluations and overall evaluations of CRPs, both to be undertaken by independent consultants. Its role in relation to the evaluation of CRP components will be limited to setting overall evaluation policies, guidelines and standards.*

On Recommendation 2- Staffing

- *The IEA will be staffed by a small group of professionals and administrative support staff (initially 2-3 staff). The exact staffing numbers will be discussed and determined only after the head of IEA, with a Director level position in FAO as IEA’s host agency (see decision on IEA’s location below), has been recruited and a work plan has been developed.*
- *The Fund Office will put forward a suggested process for the recruitment of the head of IEA, including TOR for the position and a proposed budget of IEA for FC consideration by November 2011.*

On Recommendation 3 – Location

- *The FC would like to see the IEA be hosted by FAO in Rome, and expressed strong preference to have the IEA physically co-located with the ISPC Secretariat as to best leverage potential synergies (both financially and in terms of mutual learning).*
- *The FC thanks FAO for formally agreeing to host the IEA at their HQ in Rome. Details on financing arrangements, office space and other administrative arrangements similar to those of the ISPC Secretariat will be specified in a written hosting agreement.*

On Recommendation 4 – Unified rolling evaluation work plan

- *The FC fully accepts the recommendation to have a unified rolling evaluation work plan for the CGIAR with a four year timeframe that will be approved each one or two years by the Fund Council following consultations by the IEA with the Consortium Board.*

On Recommendation 5 – Evaluation budget

- *The IEA and its work plan will be funded through the CGIAR Fund out of Window 1 as part of System Costs as envisaged in the System Costs paper (which is part of the Common Operational Framework).*

- *Financing of external CRP component evaluations led by CRP management are expected to be fully budgeted as part of the CRP operations plan. Similarly, funding coming out of Window 3 should also cover budgets for external evaluations.*

On Recommendation 6 and 7 – Work plan and budget for the remaining consultancy

- *Subject to the decisions on recommendations 1-5, the IEA design consultants are requested to submit a revised description of intended deliverables for the remainder of the consultancy, including an update on the budget for the assignment.*

Agenda Item 10. CRP4 Proposal: Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health

The Consortium Board Chair briefly introduced the proposal indicating that CRP4 plays a unique role in the CRP portfolio and adds considerable strategic value by addressing explicitly one of the 4 system level outcomes, i.e. improving nutrition and health. It addresses issues associated with malnutrition through innovative approaches and partnerships. The Consortium Board considered that it is important for the CGIAR to have a CRP that effectively fosters the emergence of a system for agriculture, health and nutrition.

Shenggen Fan, Director General, and Marie Ruel (Division Director, Poverty, Health and Nutrition) of IFPRI presented the CRP4 proposal. The strategic objective of CRP4 is to accelerate progress in improving the nutrition and health of poor people by exploiting and enhancing the synergies between agriculture, nutrition, and health through four key research components: value chains, biofortification, control of agriculture-associated diseases, and integrated agriculture, nutrition, and health development programs and policies. The key themes are: 1) agricultural value chains for health and nutrition; 2) biofortification; and 3) agriculture-related diseases; and 4) programs and policies that integrate health, nutrition and agriculture.

On behalf of the ISPC, Derek Byerlee (SPIA Chair and ex-officio ISPC member) gave a summary of the ISPC's commentary recommending that "the CRP 4 approach be approved to allow the CRP's proponents to engage with Partners so as to develop a revised proposal and work plan with greater specificity. While current work, including the experimental validation of biofortification, should continue as planned, the ISPC further recommends that approval of the remaining content and substance of the program be withheld until a more detailed proposal is submitted."

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- CRP4 provides a very good opportunity for workers in agriculture, health and nutrition sectors to work together.
- It is suggested that the CRP focus not so much on addressing "why" the program is important but on "how" the program objectives could be best achieved.
- For a balanced treatment of nutrition, appropriate attention needs to be given to dietary diversity and therefore to the development of vegetable and fruit crops, could be given more attention in the CRP. The fact that biofortification accounts for more than half of the budget requires further justification/ explanation as compared to the three other components in the CRP4 portfolio.
- Components other than biofortification require further development, particularly in terms of identifying target groups and establishing indicators of success.

- Address "boundary" issues between CRP4 and other CRPs (e.g. with CRP3.4 on biofortification, on zoonotic diseases, etc)
- Clarify in the proposal whether or not the products of the Harvest Plus component involve transgenic technology.
- The M & E section needs to be strengthened. It was not easy to determine what criteria for success have been identified; it is lacking in specifics.
- Risk assessment part should be strengthened by including mitigation strategies for the risks identified.
- More emphasis is suggested on how agricultural intensification can drive nutrition and health benefits.
- Concern was expressed about the apparent weakening in CRP4 of the HarvestPlus structure which has been quite effective.
- In the context of greater efficiency, there is preference for a management structure that is not separate from what exists in the Centers.

Shenggen Fan responded to some of the comments. On the issue of unevenness in the treatment and development of components in the proposal, he pointed out that the development of the biofortification component took almost 3 years as HarvestPlus challenge program, and has now been in the implementation stage for almost 8 years. The other components of the CRP will also take some time to develop. He also pointed out that M&E, being a management tool, will be set up fully during the implementation of the program. On concerns about putting a new management structure separate from IFPRI, he stressed that this is not the case and that management of CRP4 will draw key staff from within the Center.

Proposed Budget of CRP4:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	93.631	17.176	32.849	43.606
Window 3 & Bilateral	97.769	41.624	30.560	25.585
Total	191.400	58.800	63.409	69.191

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to IFPRI and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP4 proposal.*
- *Broad support for the proposal was expressed by FC members taking into consideration ISPC's commentary.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14*

Agenda Item 11. CRP3.4 Proposal: Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income

The Consortium Board Chair introduced the proposal as one that focuses on vegetatively propagated staple crops that constitute important sources of energy, food security, and income for over 200 million farmers in developing countries. He indicated that the Consortium Board finds the work described in the proposal clear, well-written and aligned with the SRF. A key strength is the creation of scientific synergies among 4 proponent Centers that have not been realized before.

Pamela Anderson, Director General of CIP, presented the CRP3.4 proposal. The purpose of CRP3.4 is to more fully realize the potential of roots, tubers and bananas (RTB) for improving nutrition,

income generation, and food security—especially among some of the world’s poorest and most vulnerable populations. The program is building on the expertise, complementarities, and comparative advantages of four CGIAR Centers—Bioversity International, CIAT, CIP, and IITA—along with their Partners and stakeholders. It will build on the common characteristics of RTB and strong cross-Center collaboration to increase efficiencies and capacity. The greater scale and synergies of this new partnership provide an opportunity to enhance scientific advancements, share knowledge, and spur uptake to increase RTB research for development impacts. Key themes are as follows: 1) Conserving and accessing genetic resources; 2) Variety development to improve yields; 3) Managing pests and diseases; 4) Enhancing availability of high quality planting materials; 5) Developing improved cropping systems; 6) Improving post-harvest technologies, markets and value chains; and 7) Strategic partnerships.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC’s commentary recommending that “CRP 3.4 be approved subject to substantial revisions and resubmission, taking into account the detailed commentary.”

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- Needs stronger justification how the research activities carried out on these different crops do integrate into a common CRP.
- Provide a quantification of the impact the research will have, for example on making dramatic advances in poverty reduction or food production.
- Clearer geographic priorities would have brought more clarity to the proposal and more opportunities for integration.
- Clarify potential duplications, in activities and/or in funding, with other CRPs, e.g. with CRP4 and germplasm collection management;
- A more detailed research priority setting is recommended.
- A fairly detailed market demand assessment is suggested for the three groups of crops taking a longer term perspective.
- Clarify further the project management arrangement
- Another issue is how to bring national programs which have high research capacities in RTB crops (e.g. Brazil and China) into the CRP.

Proposed Budget of CRP3.4:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1 and 2	135.600	38.400	45.800	51.400
Window 3 & Bilateral	47.400	19.800	15.100	12.500
Sub-Total	183.000	58.200	60.900	63.900
Expanded Component	24.300	-	-	-
Total	207.300	-	-	-

Conclusions:

- FC expressed appreciation to CIP and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP3.4 proposal.
- Broad support for the proposal was expressed by FC members taking into consideration ISPC’s commentary.

- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14.*

Agenda Item 12. CRP2 Proposal: Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor

The CRP2 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by IFPRI (the Lead Center) at the last Fund Council Meeting (FC4) in Montpellier. The Fund Council requested re-submission of the proposal with substantial revisions. The revised proposal was submitted by the Consortium for decision at this meeting.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the revised CRP2 proposal "should be re-submitted after major revisions to address four key areas highlighted in its original commentary."

Discussion:

In addition to the written comments provided by some FC members, the following points were raised at the meeting:

- The proposal should clearly demonstrate how the CRP will add value to IFPRI's existing activities. It should be more focused on IFPRI's core competencies and strengths and that some of the proposed policy activities should be better embedded in other CRPs (for instance in the case of policies on nutrition).
- It is recommended that the foresight activities proposed in this CRP be linked with similar foresight activities carried out by ISPC, by the Consortium, and by GFAR.
- Clarification is needed on how partnerships will work in practice and how funds will be allocated. Collaboration with advanced research institutions should be considered in further development of the proposal.
- Need to better articulate the impact pathway and the specific instruments (e.g. country strategies) along that pathway that can be used.
- Need clarity on how the other centers involved would participate in management and decision-making.
- Should include a consolidated framework for data management across the centers with IFPRI playing a leading role in it.
- Some of the points made by ISPC could not be addressed in a short period of time; it was suggested that they be addressed in the operational plan and/or in the implementation stage.

Proposed Budget of CRP2:

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	139.889	29.898	47.484	62.507
Window 3 & Bilateral	125.706	52.373	40.561	32.772
Total	265.595	82.271	88.045	95.279

Conclusions:

- *FC expressed appreciation to IFPRI and all those involved in the formulation and development of the revised CRP2 proposal.*

- *Significant differences in views were expressed by FC members on the recommended next steps for the revised proposal.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 14.*

Agenda Item 13. CGIAR Guiding Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets (Draft)

The Chair reminded the Fund Council that in March 2011 the Consortium Guiding Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets was circulated to the Fund Council and a number of members provided comments. The Consortium then decided to adopt a version of that document as an internal Consortium document under the name Consortium Policy on the Management of Intellectual Assets (the "Consortium IA Policy") at the Consortium Board meeting of May 6, 2011. The Consortium stated that its Board Members and representatives of the Centers had decided that the original document they had circulated for Fund Council comment was too detailed to be included in the Common Operational Framework. The Fund Office and the Consortium Office had agreed that a shorter document with broader application, reflecting Fund Donor consensus on intellectual assets (IA) principles, be prepared for the Common Operational Framework. The Consortium prepared a first draft of the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets and suggested that it contain only broad principles regarding IA across the CGIAR. The draft CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets was submitted for FC discussion.

The Consortium CEO pointed out that the scope of the IA document is broad, citing the Glossary definition of the COF as the common framework agreed between the Fund Council and the Consortium on common processes and other operational aspects that apply to all funding implementation aspects of the SRF including CRPs regardless of funding source or implementing entity. The Consortium CEO noted that the draft CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets document was a proposal from the Consortium for the Fund Donors to reach a collective decision and propose a revised draft to the Consortium, to the ISPC and to other CGIAR-related offices for their consideration. Referring to an aspirational date in the Joint Agreement, the Consortium CEO suggested that the deadline to submit a final version of the IA document to the FC for adoption as part of the Common Operational Framework would be September 30, 2011. In order for the revision of the Principles documents to be reviewed and approved by the Consortium Board in early September, the collective consensus language from FC members needs to be sent to the Consortium by August 15, 2011.

Discussion:

- To avoid confusion between the earlier draft Consortium Guiding Principles IA document and the current draft CGIAR Principles IA document, it was agreed that the current draft retain the title "CGIAR IA Principles".
- Certain Fund Donors requested the following statement be added at the end of the draft CGIAR IA Principles : "These principles are binding for the Consortium and its member Centers and they apply to all activities conducted by the Consortium and its member Centers, whether these be related to the SRF or not". They noted that from a Fund Donor point of view, the CGIAR IA Principles cannot apply only to activities undertaken by the Consortium and its member Centers in relation to the SRF, because the ability of Centers to contract with Bilateral Funders for activities outside the SRF is the result of the assets acquired by these Centers due to the long term support of the Fund Donor community and because the reputational risk related to IA/IP policy applies to the CGIAR as a whole, irrespective of funding streams (within the Fund or outside the Fund).

- Add a reference to Traditional Knowledge (TK) in bullet 3 and/or in the foot-note of bullet 5 because national laws on TK are increasingly implemented and an international framework on TK is nearing completion in WIPO. This reference to TK would also be consistent with the CBD Nagoya Protocol, adopted in October 2010, and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (the "Treaty"). Furthermore TK should be mentioned as the CGIAR IA Principles deal not only with conventional IP rights (IPRs) but also to genetic resources under the Treaty. It was noted that the Consortium's Policy on the Management of IA referred to TK in § 4.3)
- Since the proposed CGIAR IA Principles include the recognition of the "indispensable role of farmers in conserving and improving genetic resources", the Consortium and its member Centers should not put any restrictions on this role. This means that possible IPRs that rest on such research products should never challenge farmers' possibilities to further develop these products (should never impede the freedom of farmers to use varieties for further breeding). Confirmation that this possibility is adequately covered in bullet 4 of the draft CGIAR IA Principles (the bullet point referring to the Treaty) was requested.
- Add the following at the end of bullet point 7: "Compliance with this principle is the responsibility of the Consortium"
- The legal meaning of the language "prudently and strategically" used in bullet 7 should be clarified.
- A two-page document does not adequately address some of the concerns that have been raised, and since it will be incorporated in the COF, basic procedures require to be established.
- Members requested that the Consortium IA Policy be circulated to them.
- Clarification was requested whether Partners are permitted to patent or include restrictive licensing conditions under bullet points 5, 6 and 7 of the draft CGIAR IA Principles.
- Unanimous concern was raised that the two- page principles are framed in language that is very broad, leaving room for flexibility and interpretation, and that it allows intellectual property rights to be registered over intellectual assets produced and acquired within the context of the SRF.
- Concern was voiced with regard to agreements between Centers and commercial organizations that impinge on the principle of global public goods. Consistent with a key objective of the CGIAR reform, i.e. greater transparency, and that CGIAR research products are considered global public goods, it was requested that details of such agreements be made available. A statement made by the FC member from Brazil on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) constituency was requested to be attached to the meeting summary (see Attachment).
- It was suggested, that since the CGIAR IA Principles are high level aspirational goals, it will require understanding and knowledge, particularly given the plethora of rules and governing arrangements that apply to this area, that consideration be given to an education and an awareness program for workers and affiliates in order to effectively apply the CGIAR IA Principles and the Consortium IA Policy.
- With respect to paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the Consortium IA Policy (dealing with limited exclusivity and incorporation of third party proprietary material), the CGIAR IA Principles contain little guidance around exclusivity and third party proprietary materials. It was suggested that the Consortium look for examples where proprietary materials and exclusivity have been managed effectively and use these for guidance and training purposes.
- The CGIAR IA Principles do not stipulate the way in which intellectual assets should return to the public domain at the expiration of the agreement. A suggestion was made to add an additional principle to provide more clarity about that process. The following wording was

suggested for inclusion. “The CGIAR should seek that any results and outputs on collaboration and management subject to intellectual property return to the public domain at the expiration or exhaustion of the rights.”

- Appreciation was expressed for the willingness to get inputs from stakeholders and other interested parties, as it will be the critical for the Consortium in identifying the best practices at individual Centers implementing specific CRPs. Certain best practices could be shared and implemented system-wide. FC looks to the Consortium to capture, identify that and improve practices where they may not be reaching the highest standards.
- There is a need to add language that clearly makes the CGIAR IA Principles binding on the Consortium, Centers and CRPs, thereby the accountability of the Consortium with respect to IA arising from Consortium and Center SRF-related work. The Fund Donor suggested parties work to identify the best processes and mechanism for building Consortium accountability for the FC's benefit.
- It was noted that the draft CGIAR IA Principles did not include some basic procedures or processes. At the very least it should outline process in terms of reporting and involving the FC and Consortium when the Centers decide to restrict global access.
- In terms of reserving rights for emergency and public sector use, FC members would like to propose basic flow down provisions so Centers can enter into agreements and try to include this language in those agreements. It can be decided on case by case basis whether to deviate from the flow down provisions.

The Consortium CEO and Consortium Legal Counsel suggested that the CGIAR IA Principles contained basic aspirational guidelines in order to maintain flexibility of intellectual asset management from one situation to the next. They emphasized the need to avoid imposing constraints on the Centers that would weaken the impact of their work. These documents are a starting point. The Consortium noted that interpretation and developing implementation guidelines with Centers, Partners and Fund Donors will be an extremely important aspect of intellectual asset management. The Consortium suggested that the implementation guidelines preparation would include workshops for those who implement these rules and understanding and identifying the different situations that can occur, and providing them with tools, templates and guidance to make appropriate judgments when taking into account conflicting interests. The role of the Consortium Office is to facilitate the process and exchanges, and build trust with the Centers.

The Consortium also requested the perspectives of other CGIAR-related bodies such as ISPC as the Consortium noted that the CGIAR IA Principles could cover their intellectual assets as well.

Conclusions:

- *The draft CGIAR IA Principles need further discussion; so the Fund Office will organize a series of discussions, including teleconferences, in order to promote that discussion. The Consortium offered to participate as observer if required by FC members.*
- *Complete consensus may not be reached, however it was understood that there would be operational guidelines that will be worked out over time. It is understood that the Fund Council would have opportunity to review, comment and agree on such guidelines with the Consortium prior to their adoption. There will also be opportunities to review this as lessons are learned in the years ahead.*
- *Navigation of these principles is to try to reflect the CGIAR vision, ensuring that the best possible balance be struck to maximize both private sector participation is garnered and protection of the public mandated mission which is poverty reduction.*

- All FC Members were asked to adopt a greater degree of flexibility when engaging in these calls as otherwise a consensus may not be reached.
- Consortium requested that the Fund Donors centralize their edits in a single draft rather than provide separate sets of comments. It was also requested that the collective consensus language from FC members be sent to the Consortium by August 15, 2011.

Agenda Item 14. Decision Session for CRP Proposals

The Chair reminded the FC of the four categories of decisions that were adopted at FC4 in the Council's decision making process. They were as follows:

CATEGORY I: Approval

- Light adjustments which the Fund Council expects proponents to take into consideration

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Virtual 'no-objection' approval of the proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision will be taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

CATEGORY III: Request re-submission of the CRP proposal

- Substantial 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

CATEGORY IV: Rejection

Discussion:

- The FC Chair clarified that decision-making on the CRP proposals is a two-stage process, i.e. that the decisions to be made in this session would be based primarily on the programmatic/science content and quality of the design of the CRPs; the funding profile discussion would be the second stage of the process and would take place following this session.
- In response to the question about modifications that need to be made in proposals receiving Category II approval or Category III decision, the FC Chair clarified that they would be drawn from the written comments previously submitted by ISPC and FC members, and from those that were raised during the meeting.
- On the suggestion that some proposals may be asked to come back to the Fund Council after one year of implementation because of the nature of the requested revisions, it was pointed out that the annual reports would be a better mechanism to monitor the changes.

A table showing a decision scenario prepared by the Fund Office based on initial feedback from FC members on the proposals was used as a starting point for discussion. Individual FC members indicated their views on it, and consensus was reached on a few suggested changes.

Decisions:

The Fund Council agreed on the following decisions on the 7 CRP proposals:

- ***CRP3.1 – WHEAT – Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-Poor in the Developing World : The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was Approved with Conditions (Category II)***

- **Must Haves: Please see Annex 1**
- **CRP1.3 – Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable: The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was **Approved with light adjustments (Category I)****
- **CRP5 – Water, Land and Ecosystems: The decision was **Request re-submission of the CRP proposal (Category III)with substantial revisions.****
 - **Must Haves: Please see Annex 2**
- **CRP3.7 – More Meat, Milk and Fish by and for the Poor: The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was **Approved with light adjustments (Category I)****
- **CRP4 - Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health: The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was **Approved with Conditions (Category II)****
 - **Must Haves: Please see Annex 3**
- **CRP3.4 - Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income: The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was **Approved with Conditions (Category II)****
 - **Must Haves: Please see Annex 4**
- **CRP2 - Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor: The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was **Approved with Conditions (Category II)**¹**
 - **Must Haves: Please see Annex 5**

¹ The European Commission expressed reservation on the decision on CRP2.

Summary of Budgets:

CRP No	CRP Title	Lead Center	Total Budget (\$M)	Funds from W1&W2 (\$ M)	No of Years
Category I – Approval with light adjustments					
CRP1.3	Aquatic Agricultural Systems	WorldFish	59.420	32.273	3
CRP3.7	More Meat, Milk & Fish for and by the Poor	ILRI	119.708	35.183	3
Category II - Approval with conditions					
CRP3.1	WHEAT – Global Alliance for Food Security and Livelihoods	CIMMYT	260.508	40.967	3
CRP4	Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health	IFPRI	191.400	93.631	3
CRP3.4	Roots, Tubers & Bananas for Food Security and Income	CIP	207.300	135.600	3
CRP2	Policies, Institutions and Markets	IFPRI	265.595	139.889	3
Category III– Request re-submission with substantial revisions					
CRP5	Water, Land and Ecosystems	IWMI	569.984	334.933	5

Agenda Item 15. Implications of the Decisions on CRP Proposals

The Trustee representative gave an overview of the financial implications of the FC decision on the CRP proposals based on latest information on CRPs submitted for approval as provided by the Fund Office. As of the time of this meeting, approximately \$153 million is available for all CRPs. As it was noted earlier, the Trustee is projecting additional donor resources amounting to \$754 million which would bring the total to \$907 million over the next 3 years. The total commitment requirements (i.e. projected legal obligations to pay) based on the CRPs approved at this meeting and those projected to be approved in the November meeting is approximately \$1.48 billion, bringing a projected total commitment gap of approximately \$574 million over the next 3 years.

Based on the estimated start dates of the approved CRPs, it was shown that with total projected donor resources into Windows 1 and 2 at \$907 million up to Dec 2013, and projected disbursements at \$1.09 billion, the CGIAR Fund faces an overall “Disbursement Gap” of about \$184 million as of 2013.

The FC Chair asked the Consortium Finance Director if the Consortium could manage the expenditure and disbursement profile in accordance with available assets. He confirmed that they would be able to do so with the combination of cash flow from the Fund, income from bilateral sources and the Centers’ reserves, at least in the near term. He further clarified this position by noting the following caveats: 1) provided that the estimates for 2011 funding do not include multi-year contributions from Fund Donors who intended these funds to spread over a number of years; 2) that the financing is sustainable for future years and can be expected to increase at least at the rate of budget increase in the CRP and that there is no double-counting of contributions in the Fund that Centers currently consider bilateral; and 3) that some co-financing of the CRPs will continue through new bilateral grants, which hopefully will switch to Window 2 funds.

The Consortium Finance Director also clarified that the Consortium Board will propose a 2012 financing plan that will take the latest estimates of income and expenditure into account. The financing plan will be presented to the FC in its November meeting (FC6) and any needed adjustment in CRP budgets can be reviewed and approved at that time.

Based on the Trustee presentation and the response of the Consortium to a number of questions about the financial projections and financing plan, the Chair made the following points:

- In the near term the Consortium will be able to manage CRP expenditure and disbursements within the available funding envelope; however, there will be a funding gap and therefore the pressure to mobilize and ramp up resources remains;
- There is a need to ensure that we have adequate cash flow management, i.e. more regular, multi-year, predictable payments; the Fund Office and Trustee in consultation with the Consortium would prepare a paper regarding modalities on multi-year funding by next FC meeting;
- Urge all funders to work with their authorities to ensure that commitments are met.

Conclusions:

- *Funds are adequate to support the approved CRPs in the near term, i.e. in the initial year of the CRPs' implementation;*
- *Fund Office, Trustee, and Consortium Office should facilitate disbursements to the CRPs that received approval before the end of the current calendar year.*
- *Major effort on the part of the Fund Donors to ramp up resources is needed to meet the funding requirements of all the CRPs beyond their first year of implementation.*

Agenda Item 16. Any Other Business

a. Gender

Addressing gender issues has been an integral part of the reform. This session was suggested to hear Fund Council members' views on the issue. Canada was pleased to hear that there is a draft gender strategy, there is a line item on gender in the Consortium budget, which is also very encouraging it has been agreed by the FC that the primary vehicle for progress on gender will be through the CRPs. Canada would like to see complementary leadership at the system-wide level to mobilize that for the very important work that needs to be done on the pillars of the gender strategy in terms of capacity building, training and mentoring programs. Canada would like to make sure this complementary approach system-wide is commensurate with the treatment of gender in the individual CRPs.

Discussion:

- Members were very supportive of a strong gender dimension and gender program within the CGIAR. Gender strategy is variable in the CRPs. With the exception of a few CRPs, most have not put in place clearly defined outputs and milestones that indicate a sensitivity to addressing the important issues around women in agriculture, gender in agriculture and looking at the way R&D and technology generation can address these issues.
- Some members expressed concern that an overall umbrella group around gender is missing in the current structure. The gender platform nor the gender and diversity group seem to be in the plans and strongly urge the Consortium to identify a very senior person who will lead the gender strategy, put together a gender business action plan and manage it.

- Concern was expressed that the progress achieved through the Award program may not be sustained if it is moved out of the CGIAR. Would like to see Award continue to be an integral part of the Consortium activity and is linked much more closely to the CRPs.
- Gates Foundation was ready to provide some support for a consultancy, if it is necessary to help strengthen some of these activities.
- It was pointed out that if CGIAR research is concerned with smallholder farmers it would necessarily be required to be concerned with women in agricultural production and therefore the role of gender is absolutely crucial.
- Members suggested that it is a very timely issue to be raised now as the global conversation in development is focused on agriculture, climate change and gender, all three of which meet precisely in the CGIAR research.
- The last 8 years indicate an increase in feminization of agriculture in the CWANA region, which in turn indicates that interaction with these communities to make a difference in their livelihoods is necessary. Numerical evidence is also available of increased involvement of female scientists or agriculture engineers, connected to colleges of agriculture and therefore the training programs which were earlier available need to be reinstated to meet the demand from the national systems.
- Fund Donors recognized that gender is the key to poverty alleviation and nutrition and are interested in women as targeted beneficiaries and agents of economic change. Fund Donors see the CGIAR as one of the key leaders in this area.
- A suggestion was made to request the ISPC and Consortium CRP reviewers to synthesize the best thinking on this issue across the whole portfolio to enable cross learning.
- In developing the gender strategy there is a need to leverage on partnerships as CORAF has developed a gender policy,, hence it would be beneficial to look at other regional fora and see what they are doing in terms of gender.
- AARINENA indicated they have instituted a comprehensive study to start developing a plan for women leadership in agricultural research in CWANA. It will be followed by a practical work plan on how to develop women in agriculture and extend it to women farmers since most of the agriculture farm work is done by women in the CWANA region.
- GFAR informed the FC that coming out of the GCARD road map and now in the GFAR Program is taking a bigger picture of the role of women in agriculture and the importance of innovation and knowledge sharing specifically related to women farmers. This is being developed through the agriculture and gender partnership.
- It was noted that since the inclusion of a gender strategy was so uneven in the CRPs, it is critical in the first year of implementation of the CRPs that this issue is stressed and requires to be reported back to the FC, as otherwise it will not succeed.
- The Chair informed the meeting that the next World Bank's World Development Report (WDR 2012) will focus on development and gender equity. The main message will be that gender equity is smart economics.

The Consortium emphasized the importance of gender issues and addressing them is critical for the Consortium's research portfolio. The Consortium is aware of the unevenness in the treatment of gender in the CRPs and is closely monitoring it. Each CRP has been given 6 months to include a response to these concerns and the Consortium hopes to have more information on the actions taken by each CRP by the next FC meeting in November.

In addition to mainstreaming gender analysis in the CRPs, the gender staffing components will be phased in. Options in terms of staffing or direction or focal point within the Consortium are under consideration as the gender strategy is developed. The Consortium looks forward to all the help

they can get and welcomes any discussions and financial support for the hiring of gender specialists or consultancies who can provide technical and/or staffing support to the Consortium as it develops its gender strategy.

The Consortium continues to work with a Directors General working group on gender to build accountability at the Center level. The Consortium believes it is critical to have capacity in leadership skills and it continues to welcome the connectivity with the Award program. A Consortium Office working group has been established, and the existing gender and diversity program leadership is involved as well as IFPRI and several staff from the Centers are defining a TOR for a consultancy. As it rolls out its strategy the Consortium will also establish a gender and diversity network, and would welcome engagement of an ad-hoc working group from Fund Donors and other stakeholders.

Conclusions:

- *Members indicated a strong endorsement of the Consortium's efforts to roll out the gender strategy. There was a clear awareness that an opportunity exists and cannot be missed as the CRPs are developed and implemented.*
- *There was a desire for thought leadership from the Consortium and ISPC on gender at the system level above the individual CRPs.*
- *FC requested ISPC and the Consortium to jointly prepare a matrix to get a full picture of where things are going well and where are the opportunities that can be captured. Said matrix may evolve over time and is something that the Consortium may choose to use as a monitoring tool to assess the efficiency and efficacy of the CRPs. ISPC may engage a gender specialist to help in the analysis.*
- *FC looks forward to an update from the Consortium and ISPC at the next FC meeting.*

b. Recovery of 2% Systems Cost

All Fund Donors reconfirm alignment with no free riding, i.e. all Contributions should be subject to the 2% cost-sharing percentage (CSP). CRP budgets should clearly indicate where and how the 2% levy is being collected.

Conclusions:

- *The Consortium Office will prepare a note on how the 2% levy to cover System Costs is collected and channeled to Window 1, describing a hierarchy of actions that need to occur to operationalize this. The Fund Office and Trustee will support this effort. The note will be made available for the FC meeting in November.*

c. Treatment of Management Costs

All CRP management costs should come under administrative costs. Since there are no standardized templates and there are different ways of calculating administrative costs, clear guidelines on items that should fall under that cost category should be formulated. Once this is established, it will be necessary to retrofit the budgets of all CRPs that have been approved.

Conclusions:

- *As requested by the Fund Council, the Director of Finance and Corporate Services of the Consortium Office will take the lead in developing the guidelines for specifying administrative costs.*

- *CRPs will be retrofitted with budget sheets that show similar components of administrative costs. They will be presented at the November FC Meeting.*

d. Management Structures of CRPs

During the course of the discussion on the CRP Proposals, several Fund Council Members expressed a desire to get clarity on the different management structures adopted for each CRP, recognizing that ‘one-size fits all’ approach will not be suitable.

The Consortium clarified that it has kept to the principles that have been laid out in the SRF and provided guidance for the management arrangements in the CRPs: one Lead Center; a strong planning and management committee; the need for an advisory capacity from an independent science perspective; and strong mechanisms to resolve conflicts and to identify areas of synergy between Centers and Partners, and between CRPs. Furthermore, the Consortium is looking for areas of common ground and best practice.

A table that lays out the management structures of the CRPs already approved would be helpful for the FC to get a clearer sense of the management constructs that are being put in place in the CRPs. As ISPC has reviewed all the submitted CRP Proposals including their management structures, it is in a good position to construct such table and serve the purpose of the FC.

The Consortium has pointed out that any effort to look at the management structures of the CRPs should not duplicate its plan to examine the governance of the CRP portfolio. Through an internal Consortium Board-Center governance working group, the Consortium is engaging a consultant to carry out this work and has asked the working group to include consultation with ISPC and others in the consultancy’s terms of reference.

e. CRP Performance Indicators Matrix

The Chair clarified that the performance indicators matrix that the Consortium is being requested to provide as accompanying document to the Consortium Performance Agreement (CPA) for each CRP is a useful business tool. Such table should specify high level performance indicators and information on what will be monitored and reported on. It is expected that elements to fill out the matrix can be easily drawn from the approved CRP proposals. The FC Chair cited the CCAFS performance indicators matrix as an example of one that serves the purpose well.

Donors strongly supported this initiative and Gates Foundation offered the assistance of its M&E staff member, which was appreciated. The Fund Office was asked to discuss further the offer with the Gates Foundation.

Conclusions:

- *A light but effective performance indicators matrix for each CRP is required prior to signing the CPA.*

f. Standing Panel on Impact Assessment

It was agreed that the issue raised by a FC Member regarding the role, functions, and funding of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) which is part of ISPC will be discussed at the November FC meeting.

g. Common Operational Framework

Clarification was requested regarding the Common Operational Framework (COF), including the status of COF chapters mentioned in the Joint Agreement. The Consortium CEO presented his understanding that the COF was for the CGIAR as a whole and needs to be agreed to by both the Consortium and the Fund Council. It should therefore be developed as a joint effort. The Consortium has been leading the development of the intellectual assets principles component. Its development requires inputs from and discussion among Fund Donors. It was suggested that a similar collaborative process be followed for the other pieces that have yet to be developed. Volunteers and interested parties from the FC are welcome to join relevant working groups to do this work in an expedient way.

The COF is meant to be very flexible and there may be items to be added or dropped over time.

Conclusions:

- *An explanatory note on the COF will be sent by the Fund Office, including the status of the COF chapters and the process.*
- *The chapter on intellectual assets is expected to be finalized and ready for FC's approval at its November meeting.*

h. Communicating the Decisions on the CRP Proposals to the Consortium Board

FC Chair will send a letter to the Chair of the Consortium informing him of the FC decisions on the CRP proposals. It is expected that a similar message will be sent by the Consortium to the CRP proponents. A joint press release communicating the decisions of the FC will also be sent out.

i. Future FC Meetings

The next FC Meeting (FC6) is scheduled to be held at IFAD, Rome on November 8 and 9, 2011.

The Gates Foundation offered its facilities at the Gates Foundation headquarters for the first meeting of the Fund Council in 2012. This offer was accepted.

Closing

The Consortium Chair thanked the FC Chair and Members for their constructive participation and the positive outcomes from the substantial agenda of the meeting.

The FC Chair expressed her appreciation to all participants for the constructive dialogue at FC5, and specially mentioned the collegial relations with the Consortium Board Chair, the Consortium Office leadership, and the ISPC Chair.

Attachment

Statement from Brazil on Behalf of the Latin America and the Caribbean Constituency

“We would like to bring to the attention of the Fund Council our enormous concern about a recent commercial agreement involving CIAT and Dow AgroSciences, a private company, regarding rights to commercialize new CIAT-bred Brachiaria hybrid cultivars. Brachiaria is an important forage crop species in the Latin America and the Caribbean region. For transparency which is one of the key principles guiding the CGIAR Reform, and in line with our view that the CGIAR’s products are of international public goods nature, we would like to request the Consortium that details of the abovementioned agreement be made public. “

CRP3.1 – WHEAT – Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-poor in the Developing World

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Virtual 'no-objection' approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision will be taken at a face to face Fund Council meeting

B. 'Must haves'

From ISPC²:

1. Clear prioritization among regions, mega-environments and alternative research interventions focusing on where there are greatest opportunities to address CGIAR System-level outcomes, comparative advantage, and probability of impact;
2. Careful analysis of: (i) linkages between production and consumption and the benefits to poor farmers and consumers; (ii) causes of the overall decline, and in some countries plateauing rates of wheat yield gains; (iii) scenarios resulting from climate change that affect wheat production and consumption.
3. Development of realistic outcomes at the strategic initiative (SI) level and impact projections at the program-level with transparent metrics and sources of data to justify these targets and appropriate assumptions.
4. Better elaboration of what is new in the proposal relative to current research efforts within the CGIAR and elsewhere; and what is the level of risk regarding the proposed research.

From FC Members:

5. Elaborate of how counterfactual and attribution issues will be addressed in the *ex post* impact assessments at scale;

² More detailed commentary is posted on the FC5 website as:
https://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc5_crp3.1_ispc_commentary_9May2011.pdf

6. Have a comparison of past budget shares to each SI with the proposed “optimized” allocations in the CRP 3.1 budgets;
7. Clarify how the requested funding for SI 9 Seeds of Discovery relates to the separate funding request to the FC for the operation of the center gene banks outside of the CRPs;
8. Clarify how SI 2 on sustainable wheat systems will relate to other systems-oriented CRPs such as 1 and 5;
9. Prioritize different Sis where CRP 3.1 has a clear comparative advantage, and where there is high probability of achieving the stated outcomes and longer term impacts;
10. Develop realistic and monitorable outcome indicators with a timeframe at the SI level and longer term impact projections at the overall CRP level;
11. Improve management structure to ensure overall efficiency and effectiveness of the CRP implementation and coordination among Sis and with multiple partners;
12. Indicate activities and/or Sis that may be scaled down or dropped if resources are reduced.
13. Clarify the potential linkage between CRP3.1 and the International Research Initiative on Wheat Improvement (IRIWI)

CRP5 Proposal: Water, Land and Ecosystems

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY III – Re-submission of the proposal with substantial revisions

CATEGORY III: Re-submission of the CRP proposal

‘Must haves’

revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC³:

1. Develop a framework to establish research priorities and a SRP portfolio to address them based on formulation of hypotheses about the causes of constraints and their potential solutions. In developing hypotheses, objective evaluation is preferred to one that accepts assumptions underpinning current activities.
2. Narrow the focus and improve the clarity and plausibility of SRP research outputs and outcomes, and the descriptions of the impact pathways; carefully consider the time and skills needed to achieve the expected outcomes.
3. Clearly identify what is new and the value added contained in the SRPs compared with existing Centre and Challenge Program work, and provide an appropriate plan for phase-in of new and phase-out of current activities.
4. Develop a more coherent and systematic organizing structure to achieve better integration across Basin, Irrigation, Rainfed and Groundwater SRPs. Consider a “nested” SRP structure with Basins as the highest order, with Irrigation and Groundwater (merged) and Rainfed and Pastoral Systems (merged) underneath. SRPs on Information and Resource Recovery and Re-use might stand alone or their components could be integrated into the other SRPs.
5. Mainstream the ecosystem services perspective across all SRPs; give greater attention to better understanding trade-offs between productivity and other environmental services..

³ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC5 website as:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/crp_5_ISPC_commentary.pdf

6. Clarify the value added of research activities in the Rainfed SRP, including much stronger linkages between research outputs and production of IPGs. Because SRP-Rainfed represents 27% of the total CRP5 budget, the IPSC suggests substantial scaling back and tighter focus of proposed activities under this SRP.
7. Explicit linkages are needed between the Pastoral SRP and other CRPs with livestock systems research components.
8. Coherence and coordination are needed across CGIAR and CRP sentinel research sites to ensure the best underpinning science is used for effective and efficient metrics and monitoring of current status and trends in water, soils, and biodiversity resources as affected by agriculture.
9. A vision for irrigated agriculture to support agricultural development in SSA, and how CRP5 can facilitate it, is needed in a revised proposal.
10. Proposed research and development partnerships should be better justified and integrated into the narratives, including defining a modus operandi and comparative advantage.
11. Program management and governance should give greater emphasis to management effectiveness rather than cost. Proponents might consider merging the Scientific and Impact Advisory Committee with the Steering Committee. Explicit procedures are needed for monitoring performance and supporting the SRP and Regional Site Managers positions. An independent oversight body should be incorporated into the governance and management structure.

From FC Members:

12. Present a more coherent program and not simply a set of eight strategic research portfolios built around existing research activities. It should capture some fairly obvious synergies between, for example, the rainfed research portfolio and the basins research portfolio.
13. Proposal should focus on the potential for new and innovative research and not too much on the *status quo*.
14. Improve the justification and include (1) a summary of the main literature (with key references) on the current status of the three critical issues of water scarcity, land degradation and ecosystem services, (2) the previous and on-going research in the CGIAR system, and (3) clear rationale for the comparative advantage of the proposed CGIAR centers to conduct this research.
15. Improve the Conceptual Framework by clearly outlining the rationale for the selected framework, defining the key terms and their relationship to each other and using the terms consistently throughout the document.
16. An *ex ante* impact assessment and a systematic priority assessment exercise should accompany the proposed SRP planning exercise.

17. Narrow the program agenda to make it more tractable from a governance, management and accountability perspective.
18. The importance of institutions and governance for integrated management of natural resources should be further explained.
19. Firmly establish the comparative advantages of the CGIAR to lead the two SRP on resource recovery and reuse, and ecosystems compared to other suppliers.
20. Address the following weaknesses in the following aspects of the proposal: identifying some key soil-related constraints, treatment of drip and sprinkler irrigation, potential of land use planning, and explaining how the rural poor may potentially benefit as suppliers of ecosystem services. Treatment of groundwater should also consider availability and issues of sustainable supply in addition to policies and institutions.
21. State explicitly if the research portfolio on Basins will build on the existing Challenge Program on Water and Food (CPWF) and explain how this CP will be integrated into the CRP.
22. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes should be indicated with more specificity from the start.
23. Include a diagram to clearly lay out the impact pathways to explicitly link a cluster of outputs to outcomes, impacts and to SRF system level outcomes.
24. While gender is essential as a cross-cutting theme, specific gender issues could be highlighted (where relevant) in the different strategic research portfolios and across CRP5 objectives and outputs.
25. Clearly define partnership strategy and the roles of each partner by including a paragraph to describe the framework of selecting external and center partners, their respective research activities, how these activities collectively contribute to proposed eight sub-programs.
26. Revise the Governance and Management section to clearly define the management structure and the committees/board within the structure. This includes a clear role of the DG for the lead center in the management structure to ensure there is no conflict of interest. If the management and governance structure is meant to be a matrix system then it is even more critical to (1) clearly define roles and responsibilities for each committee, particularly their reporting relationship, and to (2) ensure a program integration body that has the authority to provide oversight to the implementation organizations, and not the other way around.
27. Clarify coordination, governance and management overheads proposed in the budgets.

CRP4 Proposal: Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC⁴:

1. The articulation of the strategy in the revised proposal should give evidence that the problems identified are recognized by the authorities in countries with major under-nutrition problems and a clearer specification of objectives related to the target groups affected by agricultural intensification should be provided.
2. Many of the research activities are described at a high/generic level and some are already underway or have been completed by partners. The revised proposal should identify the research activities with time-bound milestones and partner roles.
3. On the basis of more detailed activities and specified outputs the revised proposal should include a strategy for how these will be utilized to maximize the IPG benefits and the impacts on/for the specific communities identified.
4. In some parts (components 1 and 3 in particular) the proposals are aspirational rather than realistic and this should be addressed through further prioritization during the process of strategy development.
5. The proposal should make clearer use of nutrition and health–related terminology and articulate the researchable hypotheses underlying the major areas of research to be included as well as providing a mechanism or evidence for the quality of science underpinning each approach.

⁴ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC5 website as:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/CRP4_ispc_commentary_june20_2001.pdf

6. Further detail on linkages to other CRPs should be described, in particular making clear which work will be funded from which CRP.
7. The ISPC encourages a strategic approach to program evolution and the avoidance of opportunistic inclusion of some activities simply because they may draw initial funding.

From FC Members:

8. Address the question why the four components proposed are the top research for development priorities and how these four pieces fit together (or are linked with each other) to improve nutrition and health.
9. Consider the following issues which were underlined in the Addis Abbaba workshop of CRP4: sustainable diets, and sustainable agriculture (including sustainable agriculture intensification), and the role of food and nutrition as ecosystems services; and the necessity to analyze the nutrient content of the existing biodiversity of species before engaging biofortification work.
10. More attention should be given to priority assessment in component 1 in the proposal.
11. The issue of assessing potential trade-offs among breeding objectives like nutrient contents, yield, yield stability etc. should be included as a priority research question in the biofortification component, where the CGIAR has a comparative advantage and there are obvious IPG attributes associated with the findings.
12. Clarify the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in Component 4.
13. In a balanced treatment of nutrition, appropriate attention needs to be given to dietary diversity and therefore to the development of vegetable and fruit crops, e.g. the role of home gardens for smallholder food security and balanced nutrition, could be given more attention in the CRP.
14. Other components clearly require further development, particularly in terms of identifying target groups and establishing indicators of success. The section on value chain needs to recognize the relative benefits of commercialization and home consumption. "Boundary" issues between CRP4 and other CRPs, for instance on zoonoses on IPM / pesticide residues, also require further attention.
15. Recognize the role and potential of fish and fisheries in the CRP.
16. The policy component of the CRP needs to consider the role and impact of economic growth on nutrition and health.
17. Clarity on the issue of whether or not the products of the Harvest Plus component involve transgenic technology should be made in the proposal.
18. Address overlaps in the work done in biofortification between CRP 4 and CRP 3.4 which need clarification.
19. Strengthen the discussion of partnerships throughout the proposal.

20. Strengthen the section on M & E; it is lacking in originality or specifics.
21. The risk assessment section needs also to be improved; it should provide assessment of risks due to proposed governance model. Sophisticated assessment of what might derail this CRP should be provided.
22. Define a clear strategy on forming the partnerships. The CRP needs to clearly identify a group (or groups) of partners, including the private sector, who are committed to work with the listed CGIAR centers on this CRP.
23. Identify quantifiable and critical outcome and impact indicators and targets, and establish a set of agriculture-nutrition indicators that link to nutrition-health indicators.
24. Clarify how the pre-existing funding streams for Harvest Plus are accounted for in the final budget, and what funds are available for the other research activities over the full term of the proposal.
25. From a research continuum and innovation perspective, a more balance investment is desired to advance the agriculture nutrition and health research for development.

CRP3.4 Proposal: Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC⁵:

1. Stronger justification for a CRP on RTB crops that provides details on how the proposed themes and work plans will leverage the assets of the four Centers involved, and harness synergies and complementarities to deliver greater efficiencies and impact, compared with individual Center programs as they now exist.
2. Better description and analysis of data and key information required for effective prioritization of research activities. This includes crop-specific information on areas of cultivation relative to prevalence of poverty, utilization (subsistence vs. commercial; food vs. feed) and value chains, gaps in research knowledge, and reasons for success, or lack thereof, from prior research in terms of impact, including reasons underpinning substantial productivity gains made in some RTB crops, and not in others.
3. The rationale for the research objectives on specific RTB crops needs to be strengthened; the underlying assumptions on returns to research investments in the development of RTB technologies (Table 2.2) needs greater transparency. Ranking of global importance of RTB crops should be based on caloric content or value, rather than fresh weight.

⁵ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC5 website as:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc5_CRP3.4_ISPC_commentary.pdf

4. Critically assess the comparative advantage of this CRP for a number of product line activities proposed within Themes 3, 5, and 7; deemphasize or omit unless a stronger case can be made for their inclusion.
5. The proposal should specify which activities are continuing, what is new, and how a transition will be made to a new agenda based on a prioritization process during the initial years. More substantive evaluation of the lessons learnt, particularly regarding success in terms of adoption of technologies and impact, would help support this discussion.
6. The proposal would be strengthened by detail as to how the four Centers will set priorities and negotiate the process of where to concentrate critical mass, taking into account the relative capacities of the Centers involved.
7. The CRP management team should play a leadership role in developing the program partnership strategy; communications and knowledge-management should be part of management functions. Specification of Research Theme Leaders on the basis of a "Center quota" is not appropriate

From FC Members:

8. Clarify potential duplications, in activities and/or in funding, with other CGIAR programs such as the biofortification component of CRP 4, and between Theme 1 of this CRP and the funding already approved for the management of germplasm collections in the genebanks.
9. Improve nutritional targeting and linkages with nutrition in the impact pathways envisaged for Theme 1 and 2.
10. Consider adjustments in budget distribution among themes; Themes 5 and 6 would need additional budget allocation.
11. On gender aspects, women's participation in the value chains should be considered as a good indicator for gender equality. Also, gender analysis should specifically address the role that institutions play in determining the processes of inclusion/exclusion of women from economic activities, as well as the role that they can play in closing the gender gap.
12. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach should be developed in the proposal.
13. Proposal should not rest entirely on breeding activities and genetic stock management. Storage, transportation, processing, and market development are issues that need to be developed in the agenda.
14. The features describing "new ways of doing business" are process rather than content oriented. The proposal needs to spell out the areas that would be targeted (research investments) for innovations and scientific breakthroughs.
15. Re-consider the strengths the consortium has in themes 5, 6, and 7, (ecologically robust cropping systems, postharvest, impact through partnerships). Some of the

- included product lines could be better addressed through stronger partnership with institutions where this knowledge and capacity already exist.
16. Individual centers come with their network of partners and stakeholders, but it needs to be clearer how these will translate into a functional partnership for this CRP. Rather than being a specific theme, partnerships should cut across all the themes and be strategically selected.
 17. Identify the demonstrable links to NARES and relevant regional bodies to ensure inclusiveness.
 18. Specify clear geographic priorities.
 19. Clarification is required of the basis for the management, coordination and governance costs being charged in the CRP.
 20. Justify the investments on the basis of a quantification of the impact the research will have on making dramatic advances in poverty reduction or food production.

CRP2 Proposal: Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC⁶:

In its commentary, ISPC pointed out the need for revisions in the following four areas:

1. analysis and articulation of the major problems and opportunities for research related to agricultural and rural development policies, institutions and markets;
2. development of a strategic framework that encompasses (in addition to point above):
 - 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;
 - b. articulation of the major priorities and rationale for them;
3. enumeration of the value added of this CRP over existing work, particularly via collaborations within the CGIAR
4. description and reasonable expectations about outcomes and impact pathways

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.

From FC Members:

5. 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 sub-themes.

⁶ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC5 website as:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc5_ISPC%20Commentary%20on%20the%20Revised%20proposal%20CRP%20%20Policies--FINAL.pdf

6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The demonstrable links to NARES and regional research bodies (APAARI, GFAR etc) in practice should be specified.
9. Provide some indicators of short, medium and longer term implementation strategies for the multifarious subject issues raised in the CRP.
10. Need to better articulate the impact pathway and the specific instruments (e.g. country strategies) along that pathway that can be used.
11. Need clarity on how the other centers involved would participate in management and decision-making.
12. Should include a consolidated framework for data management across the centers with IFPRI playing a leading role in it.