

**CCAFS**  
**5<sup>th</sup> INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING**  
10-11 October, 2013  
Rome, Italy  
**MINUTES**

Participants: Thomas Rosswall (Chair)  
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)  
Takeshi Horie  
Thierry Lebel  
Holger Meinke  
Charles Rice (*ex officio*, CIAT BoT)  
Mary Scholes (Vice-Chair)  
Lindiwe Majele Sibanda  
Ram Badan Singh  
Christof Walter  
Steven Wilson (*ex officio*, Future Earth)

Apologies: Ariel Dinar  
Fatima Denton

Invited participants: Andy Jarvis (Theme 1) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Jim Hansen (Theme 2) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Lini Wollenberg (Theme 3) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Patti Kristjanson (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Philip K. Thornton (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-8)  
James Kinyangi (East Africa) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Robert Zougmore (West Africa) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Pramod Aggarwal (South Asia) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Ana Maria Loboguerrero (Latin America) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Leocadio Sebastian (South East Asia) (for agenda items 1-8)  
Torben Timmermann, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (Secretary) (for agenda items 1-13)  
Sonja Vermeulen, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-8)  
Gloria Rengifo, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-8)  
Diana Greenslade, Future Earth (for agenda items 1-13)

## **1) Welcome by the Chair and announcements**

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. He welcomed the new CCAFS Regional Program Leader for Southeast Asia, Leocadio Sebastian, who is based at the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), and Diana Greenslade from the Future Earth secretariat. He congratulated PMC and ISP on the positive external reviews by EC/IFAD and on CCAFS governance and management. He congratulated Lindiwe Sibanda on receiving the prestigious Yara Prize. He noted that the meetings with the Rome-based agencies had been inspiring and fruitful both in terms of substance and deepening partnership relations.

## **2) Agenda, minutes, matters arising and *ex officio* update**

### **2.1 Adoption of agenda**

The Chair invited the members to review the agenda and suggest any additional issues that might be discussed under agenda item #13 Any other business.

The Chair asked that CCAFS ISP members voluntarily and openly declare any conflict of interest and that in such cases they would be excused from the particular discussion. He noted that a CCAFS ISP conflict of interest policy would be discussed under agenda item #6. The Chair reiterated that CCAFS and FANRPAN in September 2012 have engaged in a capacity enhancement collaboration during 2012 and 2013 to support African engagement in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP18 and COP19 after an open tender procedure.

### **Decisions:**

- To approve the agenda, adding a discussion on the forthcoming IPCC reports and associated future events, including options for engagement, into relevant agenda items.

### **2.2 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising**

#### Minutes

The minutes were approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 4<sup>th</sup> ISP meeting. The approved minutes have been placed on the CCAFS website.

#### Matters arising

Many of the decisions taken at the previous meeting were covered in substantive agenda items in this meeting. Some of the matters arising that were not addressed elsewhere are as follows.

#### *Meeting 4, Item 5 Proposed new procedures in the CGIAR – Phase 2 of CCAFS*

It was noted that Karen O'Brien at University of Oslo/Future Earth was contacted in relation to the development of a Theory of Change for Phase 2 of CCAFS. This did not result in any substantive changes to CCAFS approach to developing a Theory of Change.

#### *Meeting 4, Item 6.2 Modeling effort within CCAFS*

In the previous meeting the ISP encouraged relevant climate modeling efforts – especially within the context of the World Climate Research Program (WCRP). The PMC

has identified the key products in Flagship Project 4, and the regional priorities. In this way PMC had identified the key needs for modelling within Flagship Project 4 and will now ensure that it happens. A similar process will be followed in other Flagships in due course. WCRP-affiliated researchers will be engaged as appropriate.

#### *Meeting 4, Item 7 Capacity strengthening in CCAFS*

PMC has continued to reach out to the Global Change System for Analysis, Research and Training (START) but unfortunately there has been little follow up as yet on their side. There seemed to be little reason for CCAFS to continue to actively look for funding opportunities for collaboration with START. The Program Director met with the Director of the International Foundation for Science (IFS) and there was keen interest to enter into a trial fellowship scheme around food security issues, as well as to jointly seek funding for a larger initiative. This could potentially be of interest of CCAFS Regional Program Leaders.

#### **Decisions:**

- To note that the minutes have been approved by the ISP via email consultation.
- To note the progress on matters arising from the previous minutes.

### **2.3 Updates from ex officio members**

#### *Program Director*

Some issues that were not covered under other agenda items were as follows. There is much activity around the launch of a Climate-Smart Agriculture Alliance, with some of the main players being the World Bank, FAO, Netherlands, South Africa, Vietnam and US. The exact details of what it will do and how it will function are yet to be decided. As far as PMC knows the goal is to put greater focus on agriculture for both adaptation and mitigation, and to enhance the financial flows to climate-smart agriculture (CSA). There was a planning meeting for the Alliance on 7-9 October (ISP Chair participated in the first two days) and the Alliance will be launched in December in South Africa. CCAFS has been working with the World Bank and FAO on various technical papers for the Alliance.

AgMIP is currently planning for its next phase and has initiated discussions with CCAFS on how future work can be better integrated between AgMIP and CCAFS. As CCAFS is also now planning for Phase 2, CCAFS will consider how to interact with AgMIP in its new phase.

In November last year the CGIAR Consortium asked CCAFS whether they could help undertake a study on mitigation potentials in agriculture and the role the CGIAR should play in mitigation research. One option would be to add a separate CRP on climate change mitigation. CCAFS indicated that Bob Scholes (also deeply involved in previous IPCC mitigation work) would be an ideal choice to undertake the study. Scholes agreed to do the work and asked that Cheryl Palm be included in the study team to give broader coverage of agricultural systems. A draft report has been completed and the final report is due soon. In a parallel initiative, the Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) has commissioned a study to explore which areas of agriculture it should prioritize in its

investment portfolio to reduce emissions. CLUA is a collaborative initiative of the ClimateWorks Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Ford Foundation, and Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. Both the Director and Theme 3 Leader have been participating in their study. CLUA and CCAFS will hold a side event on agricultural mitigation at Global Landscapes Forum (GLF) on 16-17 November in Warsaw during COP19.

#### *Future Earth*

There has been considerable progress in the implementation of Future Earth. The Transition Team report on the initial design of the program has been finalized and is in production. The 18-member Science Committee for Future Earth has been appointed with Mark Stafford-Smith, Science Director of CSIRO's Climate Adaptation Flagship in Canberra, Australia the inaugural Chair. An interim Engagement Committee is currently being established, tasked with the setting up of a full Engagement Committee. Frans Berkhout has been appointed as Director of the interim Secretariat, which is hosted by ICSU. A call for bids to host the permanent Secretariat has been issued. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Future Earth and 'core projects' is currently being developed, outlining the benefits, processes, commitments etc. under which an initiative would join Future Earth. The MoU is expected to be finalized in November 2013. CCAFS would respond to Future Earth on the MoU in due course. CCAFS has been involved in providing proposals for the Belmont Forum call on land-use change.

#### *CIAT Board of Trustees*

One important issue highlighted related to ISP membership. The CIAT BoT considered the names put forward by the nominations committee and accepted that of Arona Diedhiou based at Institute of Research for Development (IRD). The CIAT BoT is in the process of considering names for the new Chair. The other vacancy in the ISP was not filled for the reasons discussed under agenda item 5.2, but the proposed individuals can be proposed for the vacancies to be filled in 2015. The CIAT BoT had considered the external governance and management review of CCAFS which would be discussed further under agenda item 5.2.

#### **Decisions:**

- To invite Future Earth to nominate a replacement for ICSU on the ISP, who could bring perspectives on the science of this new initiative and how this could strengthen CCAFS.
- To recognize that CCAFS experience in development research and stakeholder engagement could provide important experiences to Future Earth and offer advise on these themes to Future Earth as it develops its own scientific agenda.
- To ask PMC to follow up with AgMIP to plan possible future collaborative work.
- To use the Scholes/Palm report as an input to the development of Flagship Project 3.
- To agree that mitigation should not be separated from adaptation and moved to a new CGIAR Research Program (CRP).
- To note the CIAT BoT decision to continue with an *ex officio* member on the ISP, and to

|  |
|--|
| note decision to decrease the size of the ISP. |
|--|

### 3) CCAFS science issues

#### 3.1 Prioritization tools for improving national level decision-making

CCAFS receives significant demand for tools to support national level decision-making in terms of prioritizing adaptation options, and in late 2011 the ISP recommended scaling up investments in this area of research. This typically comes from governments and multilateral donors who look for transparent, participatory and robust approaches to define best bets for adaptation investment under financial resource constraints. A number of activities from Centers and from the Themes/Regions have been working towards the goal of decision support for these kinds of decisions, and over the past six months this has stepped up a gear within the context of supporting the World Bank in the roll-out of the Climate-Smart Agricultural Alliance. Theme 1, Theme 4 and the South Asia Region have been taking a lead in developing a set of approaches that can respond to the growing demands, in partnership with the World Bank, USAID, and a range of research partners who support specific components.

A four phase integrated participatory and analytical process to screen and prioritize CSA options is envisaged. The process proposed is as follows, and is envisaged to last no more than six months in total:

- Preparatory phase: Define the geographic scope, and with key actors clarify objectives of overall CSA investment.
- First workshop phase: Options identification. First, validate objectives and set criteria weighting on three pillars of climate-smart agriculture, select indicators most suitable for context and generate a list of potential interventions that contribute towards the overall objective.
- Analytical phase: Use data, scientific literature, expert knowledge to derive potential benefits and costs of each CSA option. An Excel or web-based tool can provide the economic models for calculating cost/benefit or cost/effectiveness.
- Second workshop phase: Portfolio analysis and evaluation of barriers. A second workshop reviews the resultant analysis of costs and benefits of the interventions selected in the first workshop. Visualizations on CSA ratings can be provided and used as the basis for discussion. As a product of this workshop, a portfolio of options is identified, and constraints/barriers are identified with a view to designing the investment in an appropriate way that ensures adoption.

The products of such a prioritization system consists of a decision support tool (in Excel, via web or other appropriate format), and a detailed participatory manual that outlines the appropriate process that walks stakeholders through the workshops and decision support tool. This is likely appropriate for national and regional scales. At local scales, community based adaptation planning approaches are far more relevant.

At this stage, CCAFS is using data from Colombia to develop a case study due by end of 2013, and intends to out-scale to other contexts in 2014 in close alliance with the

partners involved. Significant potential for impact exists if the tool is developed in a way that it is applicable in developing world contexts and adequately supports national level decision-making on CSA prioritization. The presentation outlines some of the assumptions, bottlenecks and difficulties in setting up such a tool, and guidance on the approaches is sought.

The importance of ensuring capacity enhancement was highlighted. The intention is to ensure empowerment of countries in 2014 and 2015 to handle things themselves with the support of CCAFS and partners based, among others, on experience of the collaboration with Colombia. It was also noted that monitoring social benefits has methodological challenges that are being worked on.

The importance of impact pathways and participatory approaches were underlined, including linking Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Equally important is to involve the private sector and investigate possibilities for creating public-private partnerships, a task to be moved forward by the Regional Program Leaders. At the global level, greater linking to the CFS is needed. The very first step in this is to ensure familiarity with the topics prioritized by the CFS.

**Decisions:**

- To note the development of an integrated and participatory process to prioritize Climate-Smart Agriculture options.
- To ensure that the process also offers opportunity for capacity building, and underline the importance of communities of practice.
- To reaffirm the need to develop prioritization tools, but to ensure that they are demand driven through partnerships with the global and national agencies driving development investments.
- CCAFS to engage with the CFS secretariat coordinated by FAO and establish a mechanism for receiving information on scheduled topics for the annual High Level Panel of Experts reports, with the intention to contribute content on subjects relevant to climate change on agriculture and food security.

### **3.2 Interaction between agriculture and climate change as a programmatic issue**

At the heart of CCAFS science and deliverables is the issue of using climate scenarios to investigate the potential impact of climate change on agriculture and food security in order to develop climate science-informed adaptation and mitigation options at all spatial and temporal scales. This has been identified as a key issue by the scientific community, but debates continue about how to connect the divergent science agendas. On the one hand a significant share of the climate community focuses on model improvement (better resolution, better parametrization) with the strong belief that improving prediction skill can provide adequate information for impact and adaptation studies. Others advocate that for complex, long-term problems such as climate change, focus should be on

reducing the present vulnerabilities to climate variability and climate extremes, rather than being obsessed by a marginal increase in predictability of a system characterised by a high degree of intrinsic uncertainty. This type of discussion is essential and should be explicitly encouraged within CCAFS; indeed CCAFS should actively lead the scientific investigations required to feed that discussion.

CCAFS should state more explicitly what are its goals and approaches relative to this issue of using climate scenarios as a basis for adaptation and mitigation policies. Additionally these may vary depending on the regions considered, both because climate uncertainties are not the same everywhere and because key impact issues are not the same, either. Is CCAFS in a position of contributing to the building of some consensus on this matter and/or should try to act as an attractor for encouraging the exploration of new paths?

CCAFS needs to explicitly articulate what type of climatic information and data is required to help managing risks and anticipating crisis as far as agriculture and food security are concerned. CCAFS should develop a clear position on the appropriateness of current climate scenarios for the development of adaptation and mitigation policies and practice. To that end CCAFS needs to closely interact with the scientific community involved in the elaboration of these scenarios. Clearly this may vary depending on the regions and context. A key question is whether or not CCAFS sees itself as a conduit for the building of some consensus on this matter. There are considerable opportunities for CCAFS to provide much needed leadership on these issues.

**Decisions:**

- To request the PMC to dialogue with Future Earth in order to identify strategic directions and to find mechanisms in order to develop long term joint actions between CCAFS and the climate community in relation to the above.
- To report back to the ISP at its next meeting noting the importance of the subject as Phase 2 of CCAFS is being developed.

### **3.3 Focus in CCAFS Phase 2 on smallholder farmers**

CCAFS' focus on poverty reduction (and that of the CGIAR) has led to an emphasis on smallholder farming. This raises two principal questions:

1. Should CCAFS focus on smallholder farming as the best way to get people out of poverty and to increase the profitability and sustainability of agricultural systems? Or should there be more emphasis on providing pathways away from particular smallholder poverty traps, such as enhancing off-farm income and treating agriculture as a sector in transition?
2. Should CCAFS move away from the 'smallholder terminology' and focus its efforts on farmers who are *vulnerable* to climate change (poverty and lack of resources being a major determinant of vulnerability). These will often be smallholders. However, not all smallholders are vulnerable, and not all vulnerable



farmers are smallholders.

The CGIAR's mandate and Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) focus on reducing rural poverty and hunger, hence poor farmers are the starting point for CCAFS work. However, CCAFS is set up to explore alternative development pathways through its modeling of future scenarios that consider more industrialized food production and through its research on transformational adaptation, which in extreme cases involves smallholders moving out of agriculture. CCAFS also works with larger producers for certain research questions, such as those related to mitigation and commodity crop drivers of deforestation.

**Decisions:**

- To emphasize 'farmers vulnerable to climate change' as CCAFS beneficiaries, recognizing that these will predominantly be smallholders but will include the wider farming community.

### **3.4 Mobilizing effective partnerships**

Under this agenda item both partnerships and broader stakeholder engagement was covered.

#### Overview

Effective partnerships for CCAFS are those that enable the program to achieve impact (specifically, outcome targets that deliver on the CGIAR System Level Outcomes). The CCAFS impact pathways at theme and regional levels incorporate partnerships as a key strategy to deliver outcomes. In recognition of the important role of partnerships, CCAFS and the wider CGIAR have incorporated several aspects of partnership into performance management systems, and it is anticipated that any major assessment of CCAFS will rightly include partnerships as a key success factor. At a practical level, CCAFS invests in two overlapping categories of partnership: for research (e.g. with NARES and the global environmental change community as represented by Future Earth) and for impact (e.g. with development agencies, governments, NGOs and the private sector).

Mobilization of partnerships with both of these broad groups has largely been successful, though contribution to effective achievement of impact is yet to be assessed. Some challenges are: (1) establishing a good working relationship with the new Future Earth structure (given that it is only now being established), (2) for both Themes and Regions, documenting and communicating the processes by which key partners engage in CCAFS agenda and priority setting, to the satisfaction of the partners themselves, and (3) making the most of strategic opportunities of working with both large-scale and small-scale private sector to provide benefits to smallholder farmers who are susceptible to climate change.

One of the recommendations of the European Commission (EC) external review was that CCAFS should consider implementing a monitoring and evaluation system tracking



progress in partnership development. As the CGIAR Consortium has recently put in place a regular partnership survey, PMC does not believe that CCAFS needs a specific system of its own. CCAFS does however track partnership in multiple ways: types of partners, geography of partners, pass-through funds to partners, co-publications with partners. Another recommendation centered around stakeholder engagement is influencing CCAFS programming, with the suggestions that CCAFS should hold a stakeholder forum meeting once per year alongside ISP meetings, including site visits and substantive presentations and discussions with CCAFS stakeholders.

The need for systematic monitoring and evaluation of partnerships and the need to ensure CCAFS benchmarking against other organizations was highlighted.

#### CCAFS, the business community and smallholders

Many businesses and their NGO partners are sourcing raw materials from smallholder farmers, directly or indirectly. For a number of reasons, businesses are increasingly taking an interest in the sustainability of these supply chains, with a particular focus on agricultural development and improved livelihoods for smallholders.

Not many smallholders are connected to commercial supply chains, but where they are, commercial interest can be a powerful driver for development. CCAFS should see this as an opportunity and systematically use businesses (and business-led development partnerships) as agents for disseminating good practice and research results. This can be achieved in various ways, including (a) targeting businesses as audience for CCAFS result, e.g. via tailored CCAFS information products; (b) actively identifying strategic partners in the business world and building partnerships.

Farmers are the ultimate users and primary beneficiaries of all CCAFS research. We saw some very good practice reported from the regions at the ISP meeting in May 2013 but a question relates to whether farmers regularly have a seat at the table; and whether good practice in this regard is systematically applied across the program. CCAFS should actively and systematically involve farmers in agenda setting and program design, specifically through: (a) developing best practice guidance for including farmers' views and needs in the research processes, from design of the research questions to delivery of the results; (b) connecting farmers who are already part of CCAFS projects among each other, through farmer exchange visits, as a learning opportunity for both farmers and scientists.

#### **Decisions:**

- To undertake at least one high-profile activity in 2014 with Future Earth at the global level, based on discussion with the new Future Earth leaders and secretariat. CCAFS should pursue two possibilities: (a) a meeting to help set the agenda for a food systems node in Future Earth; and (b) a high-level event discussing the IPCC findings in relation to food security.
- CCAFS annual reporting forms should include a concise section in which regions

report on how stakeholders have contributed to the implementation of CCAFS' regional strategy.

- To note the recommendation from the EC/IFAD review suggesting that CCAFS convene a stakeholder consultation each year in conjunction with an ISP meeting. For 2014, such a consultation could preferably be arranged in conjunction with the planned GCARD 3 conference and to communicate this to the Consortium Office.
- PMC to prepare a document on how the program engages with farmers, to use as a reference document in guiding CCAFS stakeholder interaction with the farming community.
- PMC to prepare a focused and strategic set of outreach activities towards the private sector in 2014.

#### **4) CCAFS Phase 2**

##### **4.1 Overall issues**

CCAFS has prepared a draft Phase 2 concept note and presented it at a meeting facilitated by the CGIAR Consortium Office in Montpellier. It was well received with some minor changes suggested and now incorporated. At a PMC and CGIAR Contact Point planning meeting in London in August the draft proposal was presented and discussed, and some further suggestions have been incorporated. After this ISP meeting CCAFS will host meetings with its main partners globally and regionally to further discuss and improve the proposal. In addition, the concept note will be informed by the submissions from Centers on what they propose for Phase 2. The forthcoming external reviews of CCAFS will also guide further modifications to the concept note. It is planned that a revised concept note will be presented at the next ISP meeting.

The major differences between Phase 1 and proposed Phase 2 of CCAFS are as follows:

- Greater focus on outcomes, Theories of Change and targets
- Slight modification of the overall structure compared to Phase 1:
  - Flagship Project 1 (Climate-smart practices) subsumes Theme 1 and part of Theme 2. It was difficult to separate risk management technological strategies in Theme 2 from the technology work conducted in Theme 1, so they are now combined. Flagship Project 2 (Climate information services and climate-informed safety nets) thus becomes narrower in focus than what was in Theme 2.
  - Flagship Project 3 (Low-emissions agricultural development) increases its scope by taking more of a food system perspective, but in relation to production activities has a narrow focus on those production activities where mitigation options are likely to have big impacts.
  - Policy analysis research has had a relatively major overall focus compared to the policy research in Phase 1 and is now the focus of Flagship Project 4 (Policies and institutions for climate-resilient food systems).

Some key questions that CCAFS management have been grappling with in coming up with

the current concept include:

- a) How can Flagship Project 1 be subdivided given it now incorporates Theme 1 and Theme 2 material from Phase 1? It is not easy to see how it can be logically subdivided.
- b) Where should index-based insurance be placed? Is it better under Flagship Project 1 as one of the means of providing incentives to climate smart agriculture, or should it be placed under Flagship Project 2 given the CCAFS work on insurance is very linked to climate information services. Flagship Project 1 is very large, so that is an argument against further additions to it.
- c) What emphasis should Flagship Project 3 give research on agriculture as a driver of deforestation and the institutions supporting more sustainable commodities (such as soya, cattle, palm oil) relative to direct emissions, given deforestation is one of the largest sources of emissions?
- d) How much effort should Flagship Project 3 spend on focusing on key countries with momentum, like Colombia, Kenya, Vietnam and Mexico, compared to reaching a broader number and less quickly moving countries?
- e) China is the most significant emitter of GHGs and has real potential for mitigation. However, China is not a CCAFS targeted country and CCAFS has no local presence (though various Centers do have presence). Should China be a target country for Flagship Project 3?
- f) How can CCAFS strengthen the food system perspective (as opposed to a production perspective)? Should CCAFS tackle consumption issues?

**Decisions:**

- To endorse in general the concept note of the Phase 2 of CCAFS.
- To approve the process towards finalization of the concept note, namely the proposed consultations with partners.
- To invite further input from the ISP and to schedule a conference call with ISP to comment on a revised draft concept note when appropriate.
- In terms of thematic issues to recommend that:
  - The PMC must present a proposal for the logical division of sub-themes in Flagship Project 1
  - Research on insurance is crucial to CCAFS and should be developed under Flagship Project 2.
  - Flagship Project 3 focus on countries where there is a potential for impact, but that final decisions await the Scholes/Palm mitigation report and the CLUA report.
  - CCAFS should aim to be a thought leader in the CGIAR on whole food system issues related to climate change, including consumption, but that this should not take up a large portion of the future budget.

#### **4.2 Scope of proposed Flagship Project 4: Policies and Institutions for Climate-Resilient Agriculture**

At ISP meeting in Ouagadougou in October 2012 it was noted that the Theme 4 strategy would be reconsidered. Instead of making changes to Theme 4 PMC has moved directly

into considering how the whole of CCAFS should be configured in Phase 2, given the request from the Consortium related to the next phase of CGIAR Research Programs. The key weakness in Theme 4 was the demise of policy-related research as 4.3 became almost exclusively focused on the IMPACT model. This was partly rectified by adding Theme 1.3 on policy analysis for adaptation. In Phase 2 policy research around the climate impacts on agriculture and the adaptation options will receive much greater focus as Theme 4 transforms into Flagship Project 4 (FP4). FP4 will be purely focused on national to global policies for climate-resilient food systems. Policy analysis previously under Theme 1.3 will move to FP4. Theme 4.1 Knowledge to Action will be transformed into a cross-cutting research theme across all Flagship Projects and Coordinating Unit activities, and 4.2 (models and data) will be part of the policy research work but be very demand driven by the need to focus on impact pathways. The purely data management functions within CCAFS will be centrally coordinated and cut across all Flagship Projects.

The following is the proposed vision for FP4: “National, regional and global institutions enable food systems that are resilient to a variable and changing climate.”

Research will focus on four kinds of products:

- (1) Data, models and scenarios to understand the impact of climate change on agriculture;
- (2) Decision support tools for targeting policy development and making investment choices in climate-resilient agriculture from national to global level;
- (3) Policy analysis of current and emerging policies; with pilot policy intervention case studies conducted with national partners, with particular attention to social differentiation and gender issues; and
- (4) Analysis and experimentation concerning novel decision-making processes, up-scaling and cross-scale methodologies, policy making networks, platforms, visioning, capacity strengthening, to bridge the science-policy-user divides.

A portion of the scope of FP4 will be implemented in 2014 (through the trial in performance based management (PBM). This trial is costed at \$3.7 million per year (of Windows 1/2 funds) starting in 2014, and similar amounts for the selected projects in future years (2015-2017), depending on the length of each project. The eventual budget for FP4 is likely to be double this size, as additional elements are added in Phase 2. The proposals to be funded in the trial and how they will contribute to the research products are shown in the Table below (numbers of countries will be reduced when the final proposals are completed for financial reasons). The portfolio of activities in FP4 will be continually assessed, to ensure that any gaps are filled when Phase 2 begins.

| Region/<br>countries | Lead<br>Center | Title | Research product focus |
|----------------------|----------------|-------|------------------------|
|----------------------|----------------|-------|------------------------|

|   |         |   | Data,<br>Models,<br>Scenari<br>os | Decision<br>Support<br>Tools | Policy<br>Analysi<br>s | Engagemen<br>t Processes |
|---|---------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| East Africa<br>Kenya<br>Uganda<br>Tanzania  | IITA    | Influencing and linking policies and institutions from national to local level for the development and adoption of climate-resilient food systems |                                   | X                            | X                      |                          |
| West Africa<br>Ghana<br>Mali<br>Senegal   | ICRISAT | Science-policy exchange platforms to mainstream climate change into national agricultural and food security policy plans in West Africa           |                                   |                              | X                      | X                        |
| South Asia<br>India<br>Bangladesh<br>Nepal  | IFPRI   | Scaling up climate smart agriculture through policies and institutions: Linking it with national agenda of food security                          |                                   | X                            | X                      |                          |
| Southeast Asia<br>Philippines/<br>Cambodia<br>Laos<br>Vietnam<br>Myanmar<br>Philippines | IFPRI   | Addressing the Impacts of Climate Change in the Philippine Agriculture Sector   | X                                 |                              |                        | X                        |
|   | IRRI    | Policy Information and Response Platform on Climate Change and Rice in ASEAN and its Member Countries (PIRCCA)                                    | X                                 |                              | X                      |                          |
| Latin America<br>Colombia<br>Nicaragua<br>Peru  | CIAT    | Relevant Climate Change Information meets Decision-Making to influence Policy and Institutions for Climate Resilient Food Systems                 |                                   | X                            | X                      |                          |

Key questions for the ISP were as follows:

- Is the elevation of policy research to its own Flagship Project an appropriate shift?

- Is it appropriate to tackle data management and the Knowledge to Action research theme as cross-cutting?
- What should be the balance between global policy analysis and national policy analysis?

**Decisions:**

- To recognize the efforts in designing Flagship 4 and to request (a) a more consistent and clear language around the concepts 'policies' and 'institutions' and (b) to make more visible the objective of, and causal connections between, the different elements of the logical pathway.
- To further suggest that consideration of spatial levels from sub-national to global be further clarified; and
- To note that the relative strengths of CCAFS in this area should be built on and clearly articulated, noting the need for appropriate partnership to complement current disciplinary skills with the aim of significantly enabling the development of outcomes and impacts.
- To note that calls for proposals can lead to research portfolios that have gaps and to a situation where synergies amongst activities are not captured. The PMC needs to put in place mechanisms to ensure that this does not occur and develop dialogue mechanisms with other relevant CRPs.

## **5) External evaluations**

### **5.1 Proposed response to the external review by the European Commission**

The EC/IFAD external review was conducted in 2012 and the final report was received in late June 2013. The review focused on how well CCAFS was doing in terms of its tools and processes to manage a CGIAR Research Program (CRP) within the context of the reform of the CGIAR. In general CCAFS was given a very positive evaluation.

The reviewers made 34 recommendations, some of which were directed to organizations other than CCAFS (e.g. the Consortium). One recommendation highlighted the value of the ISP: "The positive role of the ISP should be considered as a model for other CRPs". The approved CCAFS response to the review is given in Annex 1 below.

Of particular interest are the recommendations that suggest the following:

- a. More focus should be placed in Theme 2 and on non-productivity dimensions of food security (Recommendation 1 – R1)
- b. Continuing attention is needed to remove non-strategic activities from CCAFS (R2; also R3, R17).
- c. Increased alignment between the thematic and regional programs and Center-led activities is needed (R5)
- d. CCAFS should strengthen the climate change knowledge of CCAFS site teams (R6).
- e. The program logframe indicators can be improved in terms of specificity and measurability (R19).

- f. After 3-4 years the ISP should commission a review examining the role of participatory action research approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation, specifically addressing scientific outputs (R26).
- g. If the EC/IFAD wish to have stronger influence on CCAFS programming then they should consider advocating a stakeholder forum meeting once per year alongside ISP meetings, including site visits and substantive presentations and discussions with CCAFS partners (R32).

**Decisions:**

- To endorse the response to the EC/IFAD review (Annex 1).
- To request the PMC to undertake the follow up actions as outlined in the response, noting the earlier suggestion that a stakeholder consultation be arranged in conjunction with GCARD 3.

## **5.2 Response to the external evaluation of governance and management**

The CIAT Board of Trustees (CIAT BoT) commissioned external evaluation of the CCAFS governance and management system was conducted in the first quarter of 2013. A response to the review was completed by the CIAT BoT in July and has been placed on the CCAFS website - <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/governance-and-management-review#.UI0hhNLdezi> The reviewers were positive about the CCAFS management and governance and made ten recommendations, four of which are particularly pertinent to the ISP:

- (i) The reviewers recommended that an *ex officio* CIAT ISP member was not needed. The CIAT BoT rejected this recommendation.
- (ii) They also recommended that the ISP size be reduced to 7 and this will be done in two steps (9 to 8 by the end of 2013, and from 8 to 7 by the end of 2014). In this regard, it is noted that instead of adding three new ISP members for 2014 to replace Thierry Lebel, Takeshi Horie and Ariel Dinar, only two will be added - Arona Diedhiou and a to-be-identified future Chair).
- (iii) Another recommendation was that: "The ISP should institute minimum attendance or participation requirements". The CIAT BoT accepted this recommendation. In exceptional circumstances, it is understood that scheduling may preclude some members from attending a specific meeting, but in this case members should normally miss at the most one meeting in a two year period.
- (iv) The reviewers also recommended that the ISP needs to begin succession planning for the position of chair. The CIAT BoT plans to have a future Chair in place by the first meeting of 2014, as an ordinary member, so that there is one-year of overlap between the out-going and in-coming Chair.

**Decisions:**

- To note the follow-up actions required as a result of the external review on governance and management.

## **5.3 CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs): Update on the new processes and how CCAFS should respond**



The CGIAR Fund Council has approved a policy that includes a regular Independent External Evaluation of each CGIAR Research Program (CRP) managed by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA). CCAFS will be reviewed in 2014. One of the key building blocks for this external evaluation is CRP-Commissioned Independent External Evaluations (CCEEs).

According to the guidelines CCEEs should cover a minimum of 50% of the budgeted activities of the CRP over a five-year cycle. A provisional plan for CCEEs should be put in place. Independence of the CCEE evaluations is promoted through: (a) A reference group (RG) that represents the views of a variety of key stakeholders; (b) the Chair of the RG being from the governance structures of the CRP, rather than management; (c) Transparency in documenting and publicising the decisions taken on CCEE design, scope and selection of evaluators; and (d) the management of the design process being the responsibility of an Evaluation Manager who will normally work in the CRP but with some structural independence from CRP management.

The initial proposal from the PMC was that the Reference Group be composed of two PMC members, two ISP members and two external stakeholders. The Evaluation Manager is proposed as normally being Philip Thornton (but with others taking that role where Philip is over-extended due to other commitments). The Chair of the Reference Group is proposed as being the Chair of the ISP (but with Torben Timmerman providing significant support to this role).

The following questions were considered.

- Does the Evaluation Manager really have to have “structural independence” from the CRP management – a very difficult requirement to meet and not met in the above proposal?
- Do members of the governance structure really have time to sit on the RG, and does the Chair of the governance structure have time to Chair the RG?
- Do external stakeholders have the time (and interest) to participate in the RG?

**Decisions:**

- To note the requirements for CCEEs.
- To ask the PMC, through the CIAT Director General, to contact the IEA and express concerns regarding the IEA-proposed guidelines, in particular: Structural independence of the Evaluation Manager is not easy to achieve; it is unreasonable to expect the governance structure of the CRP to play the roles indicated by the IEA; asking external stakeholders to play a part in the RG is unreasonable – external stakeholders need to be part of the evaluation but through giving input to the evaluators.
- To further recommend that the ISP be tasked with proposing programmatic topics for evaluations, approving a plan for programmatic evaluations, discussing and endorsing terms of reference and lists of key questions for such evaluations, selecting the reviewers to undertake the evaluations, and reading the final report of the evaluators and scrutinizing and approving the proposed response by management to the programmatic

evaluations.

- To further recommend that the CIAT BoT be tasked with similar roles related to evaluations that cover administrative, fiduciary and reputational issues.

#### **5.4 CCEE plan for CCAFS**

The ISP already made a provisional plan for external reviews. It was proposed that it is updated and discussed with the IEA as set out in the CCEE guidelines, in order to put a CCEE plan in place. This would cover up to the end of Phase 1 of CCAFS, with a new plan for Phase 2 being prepared at the start of Phase 2.

In previous discussions the ISP had agreed to the following evaluations:

- 2014: An assessment of how successful CCAFS has been in co-designing research with stakeholders.
- 2015: A review of policy engagement and influence on evidence-based policy making at national, regional and global levels.

In terms of timing there is little need for a 2015 CCEE, unless there is a particularly problematic area of work that needs scrutiny for internal learning. Instead, it would be better to do at least one review in early 2014 in order for it to be ready for the major external evaluation of CCAFS to take place in 2014. Also, given the required scale of CCEEs, what was proposed for 2014 is probably too limited in scope. The EC/IFAD external review recommended an evaluation of participatory action research after 3-4 years (recommendation 26). This could be one of the first reviews in Phase 2 or could possibly be done in 2015 for internal learning. CCAFS has been implementing the concept of climate-smart villages, action research sites where a range of CSA options are trialed, and would be interested in an evaluation of the concept.

The following two possibilities for review in early 2014 were discussed:

##### **1. Theme 3 evaluation**

In line with the CCEE guidelines, it would be appropriate to do a review on a significant body of work in CCAFS. Such a review could cover one of the Themes. PMC proposes a focus on Theme 3 because it has a significant component of work focused on global outcomes.

Key questions could include the following (one of which covers the issue initially proposed by the ISP for review in 2014):

- Degree to which original objectives and deliverables have been achieved.
- Assessment of how successful CCAFS has been in co-designing research with stakeholders.
- Role of global environmental change community in the research process
- The degree to which the theme has fostered productive inter-Center relationships.

2. A review of policy engagement and influence on evidence-based policy making at national, regional and global levels (with a focus on East Africa).

This topic is the same as originally proposed by the ISP for 2015, but to allow focused and in-depth evaluation of regional and national engagement and influence the proposal is to cover one region. East Africa was suggested as West Africa was visited by the EU/IFAD reviewers, and South Asia is likely to be selected by the reviewers undertaking the evaluation of the management of the theme by region matrix.

Key questions could include the following:

- Role of CCAFS as a global program in influencing global thinking and decision-making
- Role of CCAFS in influencing national policy processes
- Role of the regional approach in fostering cross-scale coherence, from national levels to global levels
- Role of CCAFS in fostering synergies amongst Centers in terms of achieving national to global reach

**Decisions:**

- To request the PMC to initiate a CCEE on Theme 3 in 2014.
- To request PMC to develop draft Terms of Reference for ISP comment and approval electronically.

### **5.5 Update on the CCAFS theme by region matrix review**

Based on discussions with the ISP members, CCAFS has engaged Dr Andrew Ash to lead the evaluation. He will complete the work by the end of 2013. The review will be presented to ISP and the CIAT BoT at their meetings in May 2014.

**Decisions:**

- To note the progress on this evaluation.
- To note that the report and proposed response will be presented to the ISP and CIAT BoT at their meetings in May 2014.

### **6) CCAFS conflict of interest policy**

At its meeting in May 2013 the ISP requested the Program Director to prepare a draft conflict of interest policy statement for the ISP at its next meeting. A draft policy had been developed for ISP. In May 2013 the CIAT Board of Trustees (CIAT BoT) adopted a conflict of interest policy. CIAT is the Lead Center for CCAFS and the ISP is accountable to the CIAT BoT. The policy adopted by the CIAT BoT flows well with the needs of the CCAFS ISP. So the proposed draft policy was modeled on that of the CIAT BoT with only few adjustments.

The draft policy guides the ISP on how to avoid conflict of interest and how to act should a situation occur. The draft envisages that the issue of conflict of interest is on the agenda of ISP meetings (as has been the case so far), and that each member signs a conflict of interest

disclosure form annually.

**Decisions:**

- To approve the ISP conflict of interest policy (Annex 2), and to place the policy on the CCAFS website.
- To ask the Chair of the ISP to ensure the implementation of the policy.

**7) Reflection on draft decisions from 10 October**

The ISP reflected on the draft decisions from the first day of the meeting.

**8) Business Plan and Budget 2014**

**8.1 Overview**

The format of the Business Plan and Budget had been altered, so that it more closely follows the now-standardized format required by the Consortium Office for the “Program of Work and Budget”. 2014 will be the 4<sup>th</sup> year of implementation of CCAFS as a CRP. Only one major change, from what initially was planned, is envisaged for 2014 – the implementation of part of Flagship Project 4 as a trial in performance-based management (Phase 2 of CCAFS starts in 2016, so it is only at that stage that the full portfolio of Flagship Project 4 will be implemented). In order to do this trial, CCAFS has had to create a budget for it, so all Center, Theme Leader, Regional Program Leader and Coordinating Unit budgets have been cut by 4% and an additional \$200,000 has been removed from each of the East Africa, West Africa, South Asia Regional Program Leader (RPL) budgets. While the major impact has been on the RPL budgets, the trial was designed so that the Centers focus on regional priorities, and thus funds coming to bear on regional priorities have increased, not decreased.

**8.2 Trial process for performance-based management system**

CCAFS has each year used performance as a criterion in allocating budget, so performance-based management is not new to CCAFS. The difference in the trial is the greater focus on outcome targets, and measuring progress towards them. CCAFS has also used the trial as an opportunity to improve strategic alignment of Center activities to thematic and regional priorities, and gives greater focus on national-level policy research. Thus a key part of the trial was the preparation of concept notes by Centers and the selection of a subset of the concept notes for development into a full proposal for the trial. In all 18 concept notes were submitted and six were selected for funding. The budget for the trial is \$3.7 million – eventually Flagship Project 4 will be twice this size, so the currently funded concept notes are only a portion of the future portfolio of Phase 2. It was noted that \$1.5 million of the trial budget is expected to come from the Consortium Office, who are providing incentives to seven CRPs to undertake performance-based management. This amount will only be confirmed after the Fund Council meeting in November.

For Latin America, West Africa and East Africa the concept notes that were selected were prepared by consortia of Centers. For South Asia it is an IFPRI concept note but in developing the final proposal they will involve other Centers. For Southeast Asia an IFPRI and IRRI proposal was selected. In developing the final proposals, the proponents will work

closely with RPLs to ensure strategic alignment. It was noted that the those selected should build this activity into their annual workplans.

10% of the total budget (i.e. \$370.000) will be used as a performance bonus in 2015 for those projects with exceptional performance (in relation to the targets they have agreed to). The activities that this extra budget covers will be programmed into Center activities for 2015.

In implementing the Flagship Project 4 trial, a number of lessons have been learnt and will be taken into account for future Flagship Project planning. .

**Decisions:**

- To endorse the Flagship Project 4 trial process for 2014.
- To note the lessons learnt in the trial and to ask the PMC to ensure that these are archived properly and applied to the other Flagship Projects as the content for those is defined.

### **8.3 Thematic and regional priorities**

In general, Theme activities reach a new level in 2014 with many more synthesis products appearing given that 2014 is the fourth year of operation. And in the regions, a number of initiatives started in terms of stakeholder engagement will shift to the point of deeper engagement in policy processes.

In preparing the Business Plan and Budget, a number of issues had been identified as problematic, as detailed below.

There is the continuing challenge that Center activities on similar topics are implemented without collaboration. For example, in Theme 1 there are a range of interesting activities from Centers on pest and disease assessment and on breeding strategies, but no Center is taking an intellectual and coordination role. Theme 1 can do this, but has limited budget to make it happen. Fostering inter-Center synergies is a high priority for Theme and Regional leaders, but continues to be low on the list of priorities for individual Centers.

Another issue relates to the boundary between engagement and advocacy and its implications for high-level science. For example, there is a real need for technical inputs into processes to prepare National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), but this is often not high upstream science.

Under the guidance of the ISP, Theme 2 hired Michael Sheinkman, through IRRI, to strengthen work under Objective 2.2 on climate informed food security safety nets. Given the increased prominence of this area of work as CCAFS prepares for Flagship Projects in Phase 2, and the limited expertise within the CGIAR focused on this area of research, should Theme 2, through Michael Sheinkman, give priority to mobilizing a community of practice within the CGIAR, or to engaging capacity through external partnerships?

The Latin America Regional Program is still undertaking a country prioritization exercise.

**Decisions:**

- To recommend that Theme and Regional Program Leaders need to find the means to ensure synergies amongst Centers, including identifying Centers to lead specialised sub-topics and resource them appropriately.
- To note that CCAFS will have to continually balance the need to produce both high-quality science products as well as earmarked products for specific processes.
- To request Theme 2 to have a two-pronged approach to securing human resources to implement Objective 2.2. A meeting of Centers working on these issues is long overdue, together with the main players in the wider community.
- To request the Regional Program Leader for Latin America to present the regional strategy at the next ISP meeting, including a justification for country selection. If countries are added to the originally suggested countries, other countries need to be removed, given the budget cannot be expanded.
- To approve the proposed workplans for Themes and Regions.

#### **8.4 Coordinating Unit and cross-cutting issues**

In terms of global-level policy engagement, communications and partnerships, CCAFS will continue to pursue the CCAFS-wide objective of embedding climate change into policies and investments for agriculture and food security, through the impact pathway of targeting the major funds and development partners. Thus in 2014 partnership activities will focus on IFAD's Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Program and the new Climate-Smart Agriculture Alliance in which the World Bank is a key player. CCAFS global synthesis products in 2014 will address the demands of these partnerships, with key planned products being a climate-smart agriculture readiness index and an economic valuation of climate risks to investments in agricultural development and food security. For 2015 it was proposed to engage in the organization of the 3<sup>rd</sup> science conference on climate-smart agriculture.

Global communications efforts will continue to be targeted at supporting regional events and policy processes, where the greatest impact on policies relevant smallholder farmers and food security can be achieved. In addition, CCAFS will link science and policy at the global level via a high-profile event immediately after the release of the IPCC reports in early 2014. CCAFS will also engage with GCARD Organizing Committee to ensure that relevant thematic issues get incorporated in the annual GCARD meeting.

As Future Earth becomes fully established in 2014, CCAFS will forge a strong science partnership to improve the inter-disciplinary quality of research linkages with policy, including via the set of research activities under the Call on Food Security of the Belmont Forum, designed to align with CCAFS.

CCAFS will also continue to pursue the objective of strengthening agriculture in climate change policy via engagement in UNFCCC, including COP, SBSTA and the dissemination of

the new IPCC reports, in which CCAFS authors have been heavily involved.

Research related to gender and social differentiation, and capacity enhancement work is mainstreamed in all thematic and regional work.

CCAFS gives attention to CCAFS-wide data management and has established several portals for data storage. This effort will be further developed in 2014.

**Decisions:**

- To engage in the process to develop the Climate-Smart Agriculture Alliance.
- To prioritize the CSA science conference in early 2015 as a major collaborative event.
- To identify thematic issues that could possibly be incorporated in GCARD and open dialogue with GFAR and the GCARD Organizing Committee. To ask ISP members to send to Torben Timmermann events they know of for possible CCAFS engagement.
- To track developments within Future Earth to identify opportunities to build bridges between climate scientists and those working on climate change impacts on agriculture.
- To approve the workplans in the Business Plan and Budget proposed for the Coordinating Unit and cross-cutting issues.

### **8.5 State of 2013 budget and expenditure**

To put the 2014 budget discussions in perspective, an update on the 2013 budget, expenditure as of June 30<sup>th</sup>, year-end expenditure forecast and cash flow status was given. Since the ISP meeting in May, when an update of the 2013 budget was presented, CCAFS has made some adjustments. Due to a misunderstanding in regard to extra allocation of funds, which the ISP was informed about in writing by the Program Director, over expenditure of up to \$655.000 in 2013 may occur. This would be balanced within the 2014 budget.

**Decisions:**

- To note the update on 2013 budget.
- To note the problem and actions taken related to the recent extra allocation.

### **8.6 2014 budget**

CCAFS started its 2014 budget process in early July 2013 by providing budget envelopes to each Center. CCAFS has assumed a conservative Window (W) 1, 2 & 3 budget of \$43 million (\$40 million W1&2 and \$3 million W3), divided amongst Centers/Theme Leaders/Regional Program Leaders/ Coordinating Unit. That budget was subdivided based on the current proportional distribution amongst the above cost Centers. In order to make funds available for the Flagship Project 4 trial 4% was subtracted from all cost Centers and additional sums from Regional Program Leaders (\$600k in all). In addition a further 6% was subtracted from Centers for a performance pool, to be allocated using the same criteria as for the 2013 budget.



The 2014 budget is presented in the Business Plan and Budget noting that final W1&2 Funds will only be known in late 2013. Some of the key items noted in regard to the 2014 were:

- 60% of the total budget (\$68.9 million) is expected to be financed with Window 1&2 funds. This is 1% down from the 2013 latest budget (\$68.6) million. The bilateral percentage is 1% up from that in 2013.
- Funds going to partners are 24% out of the total budget, 1% up from 2013 latest budget but still some way to go to reach the CCAFS Program Plan target of 30%.
- 37% of the CCAFS budget is intended to Theme 1, 15% to Theme 2, 24% to Theme 3 and 24% to Theme 4. This is similar to the situation in the 2013 budget.
- 12% of the total budget is going to gender and social differentiation related activities, 2% up from 2013 latest budget which was 10%.

**Decisions:**

- To note that the partnership portion should keep growing towards the target of 30%.
- To request that future budget updates also show Center budgets without Theme and Regional Program Leader mainstreamed into them.
- To request that future budget updates show CCAFS progress towards target.
- To ask the Program Director to formulate for the next meeting an overall strategy for use of additional funds.
- To recommend that the CIAT BoT approves the CCAFS Business Plan and Budget 2014.

**9) Annual report to CIAT Board of Trustees**

The Chair will attend the 68<sup>th</sup> CIAT BoT meeting at CIAT in Cali on 18-20 November 2013 and present his annual report. The Director will participate via video link.

The Chair will present the 2014 Business Plan and Budget for approval. He will also present progress on preparing for the CCAFS Phase 2, with special emphasis on process towards finalization of the current concept note. CGIAR is initiating a performance-based management system and CCAFS Phase 2 Flagship Project 4 will be developed as a test case for implementation in 2014.

He will also report on the ISP discussions and conclusions regarding the regular Independent External Evaluations (CCEEs) of CRPs. He will report that the ISP already made a plan for external reviews, and that CCAFS plans to update and discuss it with the IEA as set out in the CCEE guidelines. This would cover up to the end of Phase 1 of CCAFS.

Chuck Rice will report on the CCAFS response to the EC/IFAD external review discussed above. He will discuss the recommendations from ISP of reviews to be conducted in early 2014. The first review, as approved by CIAT BoT, on “Theme by Region matrix and how it is managed to deliver International Public Goods and development outcomes” is underway and a report is expected by the end of 2013. It will

be presented to ISP and the CIAT BoT at their meetings in May 2014.

ISP has approved documents outlining conflict of interest policy for ISP.

**Decisions:**

- To approve the outline for the Chair's report to the CIAT BoT at its meeting in November.
- To agree that the Chair and Chuck Rice as *ex officio* for the CIAT BoT will report back to the CIAT BoT on the following topics:
  - Chair:
    - Business Plan and Budget 2014
    - Phase 2 of CCAFS
    - CCAFS plans for CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs)
    - Development of Future Earth
    - High-level events
  - Chuck Rice:
    - EC/IFAD review of CCAFS, including CCAFS response
    - Future evaluations planned for CCAFS
    - Future composition of ISP
- To appoint Christof Walter Vice-Chair of the ISP for the three-year period 2014-2016, and ask the Coordinating Unit to follow up with CIAT administration to develop a contract.

**10) Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings**

At its meeting in Hanoi in May 2013 the ISP agreed that the following topics be prioritized for the May 2014 meeting:

- Institutions and incentives for pro-poor mitigation (Theme 3, Objective 1)
- Progress in the implementation of the gender strategy
- Monitoring of the Data Management Strategy

In addition, other topics have been suggested as possible future agenda items, and there is thus a need to identify the topics of highest priority for discussion. Additional topics identified are as follows:

- Strategy for Latin America, and for Southeast Asia. The strategies for these regions have not yet been presented.
- Progress in Theme 2 in getting synergies across CGIAR Centers (Objective 2.2, index insurance, climate risk modelling). As raised above, there is need to ensure synergies across Centers for Objectives 2.2. Similar arguments can be applied to other components of Theme 2.
- Phase 2 proposal, in particular the results of further discussions with Centers (and partners) for Flagship Projects 1 and 2. Flagship Projects 1 and Flagship 2 will initiate processes in early 2014 to get input into the design of activities under these Flagship Projects.

**Decisions:**

- To agree that the following topics should be discussed in the May 2014 meeting:
  - Phase 2 of CCAFS, including Flagship Project 4 trial.
  - Theme by region matrix review with focus on regional activities. This will include a presentation on South Asia and Latin America.
  - Engagement and communications
  - IPCC report
- Coordinating Unit to invite Andy Challinor to provide a presentation for the IPCC report agenda item.

**11) Future meetings**

It had previously been decided to hold the 6<sup>th</sup> ISP meeting on 19-20 May 2014 in Nicaragua with a field trip on 21 May. Due to calendar changes it was proposed to change the ISP meeting dates to 20-21 May 2014 in Nicaragua with a field trip on 19 May. It has been decided to hold the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting in Washington DC. Based on Doodle feedback from ISP members, it is proposed to hold the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting on 30-31 October 2014, and to organize optional meetings with Washington-based agencies on 29 October for those members available.

**Decisions:**

- To hold the 6<sup>th</sup> ISP meeting on 20-21 May 2014 in Nicaragua with a field trip on 19 May.
- To hold the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting on 30-31 October 2014, and to organize optional meetings with Washington-based agencies on 29 October.
- Coordinating Unit to send the minutes from the current meeting to Arona Diedhiou and the new Chair and invite them for the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**12) Reflections on the ISP and CCAFS, incl. self-assessment from the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting**

Given this is the third year of operation of the ISP and some members are now ending their tenure with the ISP, it was considered opportune to do an in-depth reflection on the functionality of the ISP and to reflect on how the program has developed, given that planning for Phase 2 is beginning.

ISP self-assessment

The reflection started with a discussion of the ISP self-assessment from the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. The assessment form focused on seven questions, some with sub-questions. Each question allowed for open-ended comments. The form is completed anonymously. Overall the answers to the questions indicated that the Panel members were more than satisfied with the performance of the Panel.

Most members of the Panel have now served for a period of two years and have engaged actively in discussion on the agenda items. This has resulted in a change in the responses to the self-assessment, from the third to the fourth meeting. In the assessment conducted in 2012, most of the ISP members felt that it was too early to

adequately assess the role and efficacy of the ISP. This has now changed and the responses indicate a positive perspective on the role and efficacy. The ISP also show strong support for the CCAFS program.

**Decisions**

- To note the results of the self-assessment from the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- To give more focus to priority-setting, supported by *ex ante* analysis tools.

**13) Any other business**

The Chair noted that Thierry Lebel, Takeshi Horie and Ariel Dinar will rotate off the ISP by the end of 2013. He extended warm thanks to Thierry Lebel and Takeshi Horie who were present at the meeting for their many years of dedicated service, wise advice and insights, and active engagement in the CCAFS Steering Committee and Independent Science Panel and wished them all the best for the future.

**14) Closed meeting without management****15) Closed meeting without management and Chair**

## ANNEX 1

### Response to EC/IFAD “Review of CGIAR Research Programme 7: Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security”

---

#### Introduction

EC/IFAD conducted a review of CCAFS in late 2012. The review was led by Guy Jobbins and Didier Pillot. CCAFS received the final report in late June and have prepared this response to the review for tabling at the ISP October meeting and at the CIAT Board meeting in November.

The review is framed around evaluation of processes and tools in the context of the current CGIAR reform process rather than observed impact of a specific project. The review focusses on programme provisions for monitoring and evaluation, the progress of the CGIAR reform process, and the role of EC funding within a CRP. The review focused on the West African region, and was based on documentary analysis, face to face and telephone interviews, and visits to the CCAFS Coordination Unit in Copenhagen and field site at Lawra-Jirapa, Ghana.

In general CCAFS performed well in the evaluation, as indicated in the summary table from all the EU evaluations conducted in 2012.

| CGIAR Center             | Project Short Title                               | Relevance | Efficiency | Effective-ness | Potential for impact          | Visibility of EC funding |
|--------------------------|---|-----------|------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| CIAT TSBF                | ISFM  | S         | LS         | S              | S                             | LS                       |
| CIMMYT                   | CA systems  | S         | LS         | S              | S                             | HUS                      |
| CIMMYT                   | CASFESA   | S         | S          | S              | S                             | S                        |
| ICRISAT                  | ZimGoat   | S*        | LS/HUS*    | LS/HUS*        | LS/HUS*                       | LS/HUS*                  |
| ILRI                     | IndMozGoat  | HS/S*     | S/LS*      | S/LS*          | LS*                           | LS*                      |
| IRRI                     | Submergence-prone and salt-affected rain-fed rice | HS/S/LS*  | LS*        | S*             | S/LS* but rather early to say | S*                       |
| IRRI                     | Stress-tolerant rice                              | HS/LS*    | HS/LS*     | HS/LS*         | Too early to say              | S                        |
| IWMI CPWF                | Small reservoirs in the Volta Basin               | HS        | S          | S              | S                             | LS                       |
| AfricaRice               | RAP   | HS        | HS         | S              | HS                            | LS                       |
| WorldFish                | Sustainable aquaculture                           | S*        | HS*        | HS*            | HS                            | S*                       |
| CIAT                     | CCAFS   | (HS*)     | (S*)       | (HS*)          | (HS*)                         | (S)                      |
| Bioversity International | Conserving forest and other wild species          | HS/S*     | S*         | S*             | S                             | LS                       |
| IITA                     | Agrobiodiversity of roots and tubers              | HS*       | S*         | S*             | S*                            | LS                       |

HS = Highly satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; LS = Less than satisfactory; HUS = Highly unsatisfactory  
\* = No overall rating provided, so estimated; (...) = No rating provided, so interpretation from text

The reviewers made 34 recommendations, which form the basis of this response from the CCAFS Program Management Committee (PMC). A number of the recommendations are directed to agencies other than the PMC. These are also listed here, but no substantive response is made. The evaluators have ordered the recommendations under the headings: (i) relevance, (ii) efficiency, (iii) effectiveness, (iv) practical implementation of the CRPs; (v) synergy and collective action, (vi) lessons regarding the CGIAR reform process, (vii) monitoring and evaluation at the consortium level, and (viii) impact, sustainability and visibility of EC/IFAD funding.

### **i. Relevance**

The evaluators noted that CCAFS has in place processes to ensure relevance of Thematic and Regional Program activities at local, national and regional levels, as well as positioning itself in terms of strategic research. Nonetheless, the evaluators believe there are opportunities to improve the alignment of Center activities, strengthen focus on comparatively under-resourced areas within the portfolio, and capacitate CCAFS sites. Their recommendations, and our response, are as follows:

#### **1. More focus should be placed in Theme 2 and on non-productivity dimensions of food security, and this may involve recruiting appropriate staff to increase the capacity and capability of Centres, or bringing in outside suppliers of research**

The issue of going beyond productivity dimensions of food security was discussed by the Independent Science Panel (ISP) in the Ouagadougou meeting, with the ISP holding the opinion that CCAFS should indeed cover more than food production. The report of the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change also supports the comprehensive approach, indicating in their seven recommendations that access, consumption and waste are crucial elements of a sustainable global food system. However, given the historical strengths of the CGIAR, the PMC has recognized that it has a long way to go in order to truly tackle food security in a comprehensive manner. Currently work on food security is embedded in all Themes, not only Theme 2. The CCAFS PMC reiterates its previous position that CCAFS will invest in filling gaps, via strategic research or partnerships, to address food security in its wider sense. As per a previous ISP decision, CCAFS will consider the whole food value chain, but primarily not as an implementer of new research but rather to define key questions and attract various partners to address the issues thus identified. CCAFS will also stimulate the development of important synthetic outputs based on research results from a variety of partners.

#### **2. In coming years CCAFS should be prepared to reduce non-strategic Centre-led research in its portfolio**

The ISP and PMC recognise that the CCAFS agenda has been partly inherited from work initiated prior to the start of CCAFS, and are committed to getting strategic alignment. Each year Centre activities are rated for strategic alignment and budget allocations are partly dependent on alignment. We have constant discussions with Centers about strategic directions. This has resulted in an improved portfolio of activities

over the years, though we recognise that more needs to be done. In Phase 2 of CCAFS we plan to adopt a more drastic approach, whereby only a certain number of Centers are selected for different Themes/Flagships – with a key criteria being the degree to which alignment is being achieved with thematic and regional priorities. This will already be trialled in 2014 for one component of CCAFS (“Flagship 4”): national to regional policies for climate-resilient food systems.

3. **This (“strategic alignment”) would need to be done in an objective and transparent manner, clearly communicating expectations in advance, sharing evaluation criteria, and focusing on activities with potential for most improvement.**

The criteria for budget allocation (including strategic alignment) have in past years been communicated to all Centers and results for all centres are shared amongst all Centers. In the Flagship 4 trial (mentioned in the previous item), we have spelt out the evaluation criteria for concept notes, shared all concept notes with centres, and are getting input from Centers on where they see the priorities. In addition we hired an independent evaluator to give input on the concept notes. This process will be repeated for all the Flagships in CCAFS.

4. **The Consortium Office should prepare to support a CGIAR system-wide policy incentivising Centres to focus on CRP priorities, and to support CRPs implementing it.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). We believe the CO is very keen to ensure strategic focus and has made clear statements to this effect in recent months (e.g. by stating that bilaterally-funded projects that do not support CRP objectives should be kept outside CRPs). In addition, the CO is very committed to performance-based management, as is indicated in the proposed call for phase 2 of the CRPs.

5. **Increased alignment between the Thematic and Regional Programmes and Centre-led activities at CCAFS sites should be an area of focus over the next period**

In the past Centers have been attempting to get alignment with Thematic priorities and have paid less attention to helping build regionally coherent programs. In addition, the planning tools have largely been theme-based. Given the problem that regional priorities have received less attention, we will propose a new approach in phase 2 of CCAFS and will trial that approach in the Flagship 4 trial. This will involve Centers bidding into regional programs, with winning bids partly dependent on whether or not regional program priorities have been addressed. Both Regional Program Leaders and Theme Leaders will play a major part in the selection of the activities to be funded. Through the concept of “climate-smart villages” we hope to achieve greater coherence at site level. The forthcoming external evaluation will focus on the management of the theme by region matrix.

6. **CCAFS should strengthen the climate change knowledge of CCAFS site teams**

CCAFS works with numerous partners at its various sites around the world, some very strong on climate change knowledge and some less so. CCAFS PMC acknowledges



that capacity is a problem in some sites and more attention needs to be given to capacity strengthening. The PMC will put together a web-based primer on climate-smart agriculture and a capacity strengthening process for site teams.

## **ii. Efficiency**

The evaluators noted that despite a challenging year, CCAFS has improved on its financial performance from 2010 (in terms of budget management and achieving targets). They noted that the majority of the challenges experienced were not within the control of CCAFS staff, and they have noted that CCAFS has done well to manage financial risks.

Most of the recommendations are not addressed to CCAFS, but to the CO and funders. The recommendations, and our response, are as follows:

### **7. CO should try to move financial planning earlier in the year and provide confirmation of next financial year's budget to CRPs before commencement of the financial year**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). CCAFS has seen constant improvements in this over the last few years, though there is still room for improvement.

### **8. Donors should ensure that funds are with the CO to allow disbursement to CRPs a quarter in advance**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO).

### **9. Reform at the level of the Consortium Office and Fund Council would be needed to make financial arrangements more accessible to non-CGIAR partners**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). This relates to the finding that our main University partners have decided to largely leave their funds to be managed by the CGIAR Centers because of the problems of managing the funds according to CGIAR guidelines and fund uncertainty.

### **10. Financial efficiency of CRPs would be improved if they were able to negotiate lower rates with Centres, or to preferentially select Centres based on lower indirect costs.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). The key problem here relates to cascading indirect costs, as funds move from CIAT to Centers and along to partners, each unit having some indirect costs.

### **11. The Consortium Office should make provisions for indirect cost charges on pass-through funds, particularly on long-term multiple year commitments, to be lower than indirect cost charges for operations.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). It is apparent that pass-through rates for projects have largely disappeared, and thus the problem referred to in the previous recommendation.

### **iii. Effectiveness**

The evaluators were positive that CCAFS had a range of processes in place to ensure effective program delivery. They noted that the development of M&E tools is a significant aspect of the CCAFS workplan, but cautioned that quantitative techniques need to be balanced by qualitative methods. They considered that the programme logframe was internally consistent, but they called for the indicators to be improved in terms of specificity and measurability.

Their recommendations, and our response, are as follows:

#### **12. The positive role of the ISP should be considered as a model for other CRPs.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO).

#### **13. Quantitative impact assessment tool should be complemented by qualitative assessments examining farming systems and decision-making.**

This recommendation refers to the fact that CCAFS has established baseline surveys in all of its core sites and is complementing them with various modelling studies. These baselines are indeed a mixture of the quantitative and the qualitative (the village and organisational baseline surveys particularly are essentially qualitative). In addition, it should be noted that not all (or even most) of CCAFS's impact will occur at these core sites and will thus be amenable to measurement using the CCAFS baselines. A substantial part of the CCAFS portfolio of activities is taking place in other sites and regions, and for these, different baselines are being undertaken to monitor impact, again using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative tools. With the move to performance-based monitoring, the identification and measurement of annual indicators that can demonstrate progress by Centres, Themes and Regions towards CCAFS's outcomes becomes critically important, and this will continue to require an appropriate mix of quantitative and qualitative approaches.

#### **14. CCAFS should strengthen internal processes for planning and integrating activities to ensure that challenges in programme management are not contributing to additional delays in participatory processes at CCAFS sites.**

This recommendation comes about because of the numerous small contracts of short duration that were analysed in relation to the West African site visit of the evaluators. The evaluators were referring to the first year of operation (2011) when funding uncertainty and late arrival of funds was at its worst extreme, and ICRISAT was not willing to pre-finance activities until funding was more certain. The situation has greatly improved since then and much larger multi-year contracts are being issued.

#### **15. CCAFS needs to focus on approaches for integrating research results from multiple activities, partners and sites.**

The evaluators recognise that integration is happening through the Head of Research, Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders, but they are concerned that the majority of current CCAFS funds are in Center-led activities not located at CCAFS sites. Therefore there is an important need to develop ways to integrate these activities and their findings into a functional analytical framework. CCAFS PMC believes that the process that has been started for Phase 2 (i.e. the Flagship 4 trial) will achieve much

greater coherence within regions and across the whole Flagship. This topic is also one of those that will be tackled in the forthcoming matrix evaluation.

**16. CCAFS should consider accepting multi-year project proposals to ensure that annual research activities are strategic.**

This largely refers to the problem already addressed in R14 – that of short-term contracts. This problem has been addressed. In addition, in the second phase, each Center will be bidding into a long-term project, not a single year activity.

**17. CCAFS should screen Centre-led proposals more rigorously, rewarding strategic research with increased funding and withdrawing funding from non-strategic research**

This is definitely what CCAFS has been doing, but the process will be intensified as we put together the portfolio for phase 2. This issue has been referred to under our response to R2.

**18. CCAFS should consider implementing a monitoring and evaluation system tracking progress in partnership development.**

As the Consortium has recently put in place a regular partnership survey, we don't believe CCAFS needs a specific system of its own. CCAFS is however now tracking partnerships in multiple ways: types of partners, geography of partners, pass-through funds to partners and co-publications with partners.

**19. The specificity, measurability and achievability of logframe indicators should be improved if the document is to be used for accountability purposes**

CCAFS will ensure that this is done.

**iv. Practical implementation of the CRPs**

Their recommendations are follows:

**20. CCAFS should move towards longer term work-planning and contracting at each site**

The evaluators stress the need to develop longer-term workplans and contracts for CCAFS sites as this would reduce transaction costs and strengthen integration between Regional and Thematic Programmes, and would reduce burdens on participating country partners. The evaluators are largely referring to a situation in year 1 when funding uncertainty was at its extreme. The issue has been tackled under R14 and R16. The situation has greatly improved since then and much larger multi-year contracts are being issued.

**v. Synergy and collective action**

The evaluators note that there are positive signs of engagement between CRPs.

**21. In the future, the Consortium Office and/or donors may wish to map and evaluate synergies between CRPs**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). In CCAFS we are aware of numerous recent efforts by the CO to achieve synergies amongst CRPs. This has been late in coming but it is only recently that the CO is fully staffed.

**vi. Lessons regarding the CGIAR reform process**

This set of issues and those in the following sections largely refer to broader issues than to CCAFS specifically. The evaluators note that there is a need for increased, but flexible, harmonisation between Centers and CRPs of policies and procedures. They also discuss where CRPs should be placed in relation to CO and Lead Centers. They also express a concern about the tension between an increased focus on achieving development impact and supporting high quality research, although they do say that as yet there are no indications that this is a problem in CCAFS.

**22. The capacity of the Consortium Office to generate harmonisation and manage the reform process should be reinforced.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). The staffing level in the CO has been substantially improved in recent months, and CCAFS recent experience is that much greater effort is going into harmonisation.

**23. Over the medium term (2-3 years) the CO should map policy areas requiring harmonization and institute reviews across Centres with a view to harmonise, where possible**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO).

**24. Over a longer term period, as the reform process stabilizes, the CGIAR may wish to consider reorienting governance towards a matrix management style with CRP directors reporting directly to the CO rather than to Centre DGs**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO).

**25. Institutionalise mechanisms within the Consortium Office and CRPs for strategic engagement with non-CGIAR research institutions.**

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). This recommendation largely refers to a perceived lack of sufficient engagement with partners outside the CGIAR, partly due to issues related to uncertainty of funds and thus reduced opportunities for longer term strategic partnerships (in cases where funds are needed to support such partnerships). The evaluators note that CCAFS should be in a position to engage with recipients of significant resources from outside the CGIAR and shape their research. Options might include offering top-up funding to universities receiving research grants that align with CCAFS priorities. The evaluators note that current management systems do not incentivise such behaviour from CRPs (because leveraged funds are not counted by the CGIAR). Starting from 2013 CCAFS will indeed start record funds leveraged through partnerships. It will continue to attempt to forge longer term partnerships with the global change community.

26. **After 3-4 years the ISP should commission a review examining the role of participatory action research approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation, specifically addressing scientific outputs.**

It is proposed to focus an evaluation on this topic in early 2016.

27. **CO to establish working group on the conditions for production of international science in the context of field-based action research**

The major concern is that field based action research may not lead to IPGs. This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO). CCAFS will examine the degree to which its action research is generating IPGs in the evaluation proposed in the previous recommendation.

#### **vii. Monitoring and Evaluation at the Consortium Level**

The evaluators have deep concerns that a focus on making research accountable for development impact is misplaced, and that the CGIAR would be better served by M&E frameworks focused on evaluative learning. The evaluators are also mindful of the potential tension between the nature of research and the tendency of accountability frameworks to incentivize low risk behaviour. CCAFS management team does not see this as a problem as both impact and science outputs are monitored for performance. Their recommendations will all be communicated to the CO. They are as follows:

28. **The final CGIAR SRF and M&E strategy should incentivize innovative, collaborative and high quality research, which allows for the possibility of failure**
29. **The CO should manage expectations and ambitions for the ability to rigorously assess the development impact of research. A focus on evaluative learning rather than accountability would support better programme performance.**
30. **As the SRF evolves, increasing emphasis should be placed on the evaluation of quality research as the vehicle for achieving development impact.**

#### **viii. Impact, sustainability and visibility of EC/IFAD funding**

The evaluators note that the current EC/IFAD funding arrangements result in delays in disbursing funds and do add to the programme's financial uncertainty and pose a reputational risk to EC/IFAD.

Their recommendations, and our response, are as follows:

31. **Switching to multi-year commitments would reduce the transaction costs of CCAFS, as would abandon thematic and geographic earmarking**

This refers to the need in the EC to move to multi-year funding that does not earmark regions and themes. This essentially means moving funds from Window 3 to Window 1. This recommendation is for the EC to consider, not CCAFS.

32. If the EC/IFAD wish to have stronger influence on CCAFS programming then they should consider advocating a stakeholder forum meeting once per year alongside ISP meetings, including site visits and substantive presentations and discussions with CCAFS partners.

CCAFS proposes to invite a selection of partners to an annual stakeholder forum where CCAFS and partner science and engagement activities and plans are presented. Where field trips are planned in association with ISP meetings, the partners attending the stakeholder forum will be invited.

33. Other options for increasing collaborations with EU research include supporting participation of EU knowledge centres in CRPs, and providing backstopping support to the CO to better accommodate such participation.

This recommendation will be communicated to the Consortium Office (CO).

34. EC/IFAD should streamline contracting and disbursement procedures to reduce transaction costs and financial uncertainty of CCAFS, and reduce reputational risk to the EC and IFAD.

This recommendation is for the EC to consider, not CCAFS.

## **ANNEX 2**

### **CGIAR RESEARCH PROGRAM ON CLIMATE CHANGE, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY (CCAFS) INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL**

#### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY**

The CCAFS Independent Science Panel (ISP) is established to ensure independence of the programmatic directions of CCAFS. The ISP is accountable to, and appointed by, the CIAT Board of Trustees as the CGIAR Lead Center of CCAFS.

CCAFS ISP members act in their best capacity and are expected to manage their relationships with other ISP members, CIAT BoT, CCAFS staff, donors, and partners with objectivity and integrity. It is clear that if a CCAFS ISP member has affiliation(s) with any of the above it is not considered in and of itself a Conflict of Interest, as it is in the best interest of CCAFS that such CCAFS ISP members, through their relations and affiliations, have a comprehensive world view as well as networks of connections to further the goals and objectives of CCAFS.

This policy guides members in identifying and handling potential conflicts of interest that may arise in a given case, enabling them to provide the relevant information required for each situation to be addressed appropriately. A potential conflict of interest refers to any interests or activities (be they professional, financial, personal, and/or others) that may influence or impair objectivity in the sense of preventing the ISP members from performing their duties and responsibilities as CCAFS ISP members in the best interest of CCAFS and in an unbiased manner.

All CCAFS ISP members maintain the highest degree of integrity in their work and avoid potential conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflict. CCAFS ISP members are alert to situations that might cause a conflict of interest and take appropriate action to prevent conflict or disclose it. CCAFS ISP members are trusted to perform sound judgment to prevent and disclose any potential conflict of interest. Members must adhere to this policy and declare/sign annually a Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form (Appendix A) which will be kept on the ISP file by the Coordinating Unit. Declaration of Conflict of Interest shall be a standard item of ISP meeting agendas and appropriate record of this declaration shall be kept in all ISP meeting minutes.

If a conflict of interest arises, CCAFS ISP members must inform the ISP Chair who will decide on his/her participation and voting rights in the specific discussion and decision making process. If the ISP Chair is impaired to resolve the case or has a conflict of interest, the case shall be evaluated by the Vice Chair.





## APPENDIX A: CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM

Name:

Current Employer:

Role in the CCAFS ISP:

1. Please list all significant and **relevant professional activities** that might be considered conflict of interest if it applies to you. These may include employment and/or consulting relationships.

2. Please list current, significant, and **relevant financial interests** that may be viewed as impairing objectivity in carrying out ISP duties and responsibilities or may create an unfair advantage for you or any person or organization. These may include financial investments, intellectual property and commercial interests and sources of private sector research support.

3. Please provide any **other relevant information** that may affect objectivity or independence to perform in your role as a member of the ISP if it applies to you.

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that the information provided is complete and accurate. I understand that this form will be considered confidential and will be reviewed annually or before if my situation changes as stated in the Conflict of Interest Policy.

I hereby declare that I will comply with the CCAFS ISP Conflict of Interest Policy.

---

ISP member

Date