

CCAFS
7th INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING
30-31 October, 2014
Washington DC, USA
MINUTES

Participants:

Thomas Rosswall (Chair)
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)
Arona Diedhiou
Fatima Denton
Brian Keating

Holger Meinke
Charles Rice (*ex officio*, CIAT BoT)
Ram Badan Singh
Carolina Vera (*ex officio*, Future Earth)
Christof Walter (Vice Chair)

Apologies:

Mary Scholes

Lindiwe Majele Sibanda (stepped down September

2014)

Invited participants:

Program Management Committee

Andy Jarvis, Theme 1 (for agenda items 1-11)

Lini Wollenberg, Theme 3 (for agenda items 1-11)

Robert Zougmoré, West Africa (for agenda items 1-

11)

Pramod Aggarwal, South Asia (for agenda items 1-11)

Sonja Vermeulen, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-11)

Others

Simon Anderson, IEA evaluation of CCAFS (for agenda items 1-17)

Martin Lund (for agenda items 8, 10-17) (check with him)

Philip Thornton, Theme 4 (for agenda items 1-11)

Angela Samundengo, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-11)

Ratih Septivita (for agenda items 1-7, 9) (check with her)

1) Welcome by the Chair and announcements

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the participants and noted that Mary Scholes was unable to attend the meeting. He also reported that Lindiwe Sibandea had decided to leave the ISP because of her many other commitments. He welcomed Simon Anderson as the IEA evaluator for CCAFS, who will attend the meeting as an observer. He also welcomed the new CCAFS Program Manager, Martin Lund.

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 #17 Any other business. The Director noted that the draft report on Theme 3 was not yet available. The Chair asked that CCAFS ISP members voluntarily and openly declare any conflict of interest. There were none. He thanked members for having completed the conflict of interest form as requested at the meeting in May.

Decisions:

- To approve the agenda
- To postpone agenda item 10.1 *"Draft report for the CCEE evaluation of Theme 3"* until the next meeting

2.2 Minutes and follow-ups on previous meetings and matters arising

Minutes

The minutes were approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 6th ISP meeting. The approved minutes have been placed on the CCAFS website.

Follow-up actions from previous meetings

Key actions and follow-ups on decisions from previous meetings are outlined in Annex 1.

Matters arising

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

Meeting #6, Item 14, Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings

When developing the final agenda for ISP7 it was agreed to defer "Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy" until the new CCAFS gender specialist is in place. Also it was decided to defer "Private sector engagement: update" to May 2015, when full implementation of the 2014 work has been completed. Systematic implementation of activities with private sector has been initiated as envisaged by ISP, including the post-IPCC event in partnership with Willis Re and webinars for private sector audiences in the CCAFS regions. There is ongoing research and engagement across the CCAFS portfolio, including CIAT work under Theme 1 with Green Mountain Coffee, South Asia work under Theme 2 with Agricultural Insurance Corporation of India and ICT providers, and ICRAF/ILRI work under Theme 3 with the East Africa Dairy Development partnership.

The ISP asked that the PMC create a mechanism of aligning CCAFS needs with those of Centers to facilitate human resources planning. In this regard each of the participating Centers will be visited by management team members to discuss the vision of CCAFS for the future program, the risks involved in terms of budgets, and the human resource gaps and needs. Centers will be asked for their perspective. The overall objective is to get alignment about the future development of the program and joint ownership.

The ISP requested that CCAFS create an internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas. The PMC suggested this be postponed until 2016. Funds have been earmarked for this purpose, but the initiative should only be implemented in 2016, because of: (a) budget pressures in 2015 when funds are needed to phase out Phase 1 activities; and (b) the concept note selection process that makes much of 2015 innovative.

The requested review of CCAFS and CGIAR citations in AR5, to inform future strategy, will be conducted in the last three months of 2014.

The PMC was asked to consider creating a database of scientists in the CCAFS regions that will extend the pool of scientists who can make a contribution to, e.g., IPCC reports. PMC considered this request carefully. Noting that considerable work would be involved to establish and maintain such a database, while the timing and method of any future IPCC report is uncertain, PMC has decided to continue to maintain a database of CCAFS research partners but not to extend this to non-CCAFS partners. PMC will be ready to come forward with nominations of scientists from the CCAFS regions in the event of an announcement of a future IPCC report.

Decisions:

- To note that the minutes from the 6th meeting have been approved by the ISP via email consultation.
- To note the progress on matters arising from the previous minutes.
- To request a report back from the management on how Centers reacted to the visits to facilitate CCAFS-Center relationships, including CCAFS-relevant human resources planning.
- To note that issue of an internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas will be returned to in late 2015, ready for implementation in 2016.
- To request that the results of the bibliometric study of the IPCC report in relation to CGIAR role be presented at the next ISP meeting.

2.3 Updates from *ex officio* members

Program Director

Since the last meeting of the ISP, one of the main activities of the CCAFS management team has been the reorientation of the research portfolios in all of the Flagships, in readiness for this meeting and the extension

phase starting in 2015. This has gone relatively smoothly, but not without many anxieties in Centers, given the quite large shifts in activities that have taken place. Further calls for concept notes were held and selection committees (always with external evaluators) identified the top concept notes for taking forward. In a final step in the process, CCAFS Regional Program Leaders are conducting regional planning meetings so that the selected “Flagship Projects” can finalize their design, be integrated into regional strategies and develop their more detailed set of activities (meetings taking place from September through to November). This process has also resulted in quite a major re-design of the CCAFS web-based planning and reporting system (P&R), whereby projects input their indicators and targets, and spell out their proposed activities. Annual reporting is also done against this framework. The P&R was a major achievement led by David Abreu at CIAT (CCAFS data manager).

The Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA) has been launched in New York during September at the UN Climate Change Summit. CGIAR (with CCAFS in support) then hosted the 1st Alliance meeting in New York, together with partners (e.g. FAO). The vision is that this becomes a major global learning platform for CSA focussing on action on the ground. CCAFS has been deeply involved in the development of GACSA.

The CGIAR reorientation towards Phase 2 continues with the revision of the “CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework” (SRF) and the Mid-Term Review of the CGIAR by the team led by Sir John Beddington. Early versions of the envisioned “System-Level Outcomes” and “Intermediate Development Outcomes” did not include climate change, which seems strange. The SRF text has climate change as a cross-cutting theme, in the same category as gender and capacity development. While a new version of the SRF has been considered by Consortium Board and Fund Council further revisions are expected, with the SRF due to be complete in early 2015.

CCAFS has had two significant staff changes in the last few months. With the phasing out of the “Linking Knowledge with Action” research theme and its replacement by a theme on “Gender and Social Inequality”, CCAFS is in the process of hiring a coordinator for this new role. In addition, CCAFS is hiring a replacement for the Head of Program Coordination and Communications, Torben Timmermann, who has also served as Secretary to ISP.

The Belmont Forum is near to completion of its selection of full proposals for its joint call with FACCE-JPI on Food Security and Land Use Change. CCAFS has participated in the selection panel through its ISP Chair. Several of the winning proposals are likely to be of interest to CCAFS.

Future Earth

Future Earth is moving forward rapidly. It will have a new secretariat with a unique and innovative structure that spans three continents, with five global hubs which will function as a single entity. The hubs are to be located in Canada (Montreal), France (Paris), Japan (Tokyo), Sweden (Stockholm) and the United States (Colorado). The Science Committee met in June. An announcement on the Future Earth Engagement Committee is expected soon.

Future Earth is close to finalizing two major documents that will frame the vision and scientific priorities for Future Earth. The first of these is the ‘Future Earth 2025 Vision’. This is a short 2 page document outlining what Future Earth aims to have contributed towards its vision for a sustainable and equitable world by 2025. Secondly, a ‘Future Earth Strategic Research Agenda 2014’ has been developed, providing a set of

research questions that are seen as priorities for the medium term (3-5 years). The research agenda has been co-designed through bringing three strands of consultation together: (1) priorities from the Future Earth scientific community, i.e. the Core Projects; (2) engagement with external stakeholders and new communities; and (3) an assessment of other recent and ongoing priority-setting processes related to global change and sustainability. The Future Earth Science and Interim Engagement Committees are currently finalizing these two documents and they will be published towards the end of 2014.

Future Earth has been having regular project webinars, and CCAFS has participated in most of them, including through giving a CCAFS presentation. CCAFS-Future Earth hosted a workshop in Copenhagen in late October "Towards a global research program on food systems". The objectives were to identify research gaps that can form the basis of a global research program, and to identify mechanisms to exploit synergies amongst on-going initiatives. Future Earth has identified a number of cluster activities and fast track initiatives.

CCAFS is participating in two of those.

CIAT Board of Trustees

At the last Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting in late May, Sonja Vermeulen, CCAFS Head of Research, gave the programmatic update, while Chuck Rice, BoT representative to CCAFS ISP, reported back on the CCAFS ISP meeting.

In the programmatic update, topics presented included: update on progress (annual report 2013) outcomes, major outputs, gender, risk management, financial summary, and the CCAFS Extension Phase (2015-2016) concept note that has been previously circulated and approved by the BoT. In the discussion it was noted that there are grey areas related to boundaries between CRPs. This can be an opportunity or a challenge depending on how it is addressed. Main areas for collaboration identified are at regional and ground levels through joint research sites. The risk may increase under the new system in which Centers are allowed to have bilateral funding outside CRPs. The BoT requested CCAFS to present at the November meeting how the BoT can help with the issues of defining boundaries for climate change so that CRPs work on climate change is aligned and collaborative with CCAFS. The BoT noted the great work of CCAFS in moving forward in the Extension Proposal as well as Phase 2 at the Consortium and partnership levels.

On the ISP meeting, the CIAT Board reviewed and approved the terms of reference of the external and internal evaluations of CCAFS. On the Andrew Ash report (theme by region matrix), it was noted that recommendations 2, 3 and 4 are labor intensive and costly and the budget proposal for the Extension do not include a line item for this. In regards to the CCAFS management response to the report, the BoT noted that it has concerns related to labor intensiveness and costs of recommendations as well as the messages sent to the Consortium Office through the Extension and Phase 2 proposal. The BoT noted the existence of the ISP Governance Guidelines and expressed their appreciation for their transparency to define their role. The ISP Governance Guidelines are being discussed by the BoT under Chuck Rice's leadership. This item will be addressed in the upcoming November meeting.

The BoT appointed Mercedes Bustamante a member of the ISP for the period 1 January 2015 – 31 December 2017.

Decisions:

- To note the updates
- To express great appreciation to Torben Timmerman for his past work as Secretary to ISP
- To request the Beddington CGIAR Mid-term Review to be circulated to ISP members
- To circulate the Future Earth strategic research agenda to the ISP, when ready.
- To discuss Future Earth – CCAFS interactions once the Future Earth strategic research agenda has been finalised
- To prepare within the next couple of weeks a quarter/half page briefing summary to the CIAT Board Chair of status of the climate change and food security portfolio of CGIAR as seen from CCAFS perspective

3) CCAFS science issues**3.1 Climate-Smart Agriculture in South Asia: scientific initiatives for scaling out**

CCAFS's vision in South Asia is to promote large-scale investment in science-informed Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices, institutions and policies, leading to long-term food security and poverty alleviation. CCAFS South Asia is targeting 10 million farmers transitioning to CSA by 2025 through policy changes, systematic institutional investments, and developing new business models around public-private partnerships using knowledge, tools and approaches derived from CCAFS science. This is illustrated with three examples:

1. Climate risk management: In India, almost 30 million farmers are insured under a variety of government supported schemes. Nearly 12 million of these are covered under weather-based index insurance programs. Despite government subsidies, many farmers remain uninsured and dissatisfied with current insurance products due to poor transparency, delays in processing the claims, and lack of appropriate insurance triggers at the local level. CCAFS is working with insurance companies and other stakeholders to help design innovative insurance products to improve farmer satisfaction, while ensuring that the schemes are not too costly. An atlas of weather indices is being developed together with national partners for major crops for different agro-ecological regions. Management, reporting and verification of insurance schemes by farming communities themselves using ICT tools is another novel scheme being piloted with the support of the Agricultural Insurance Company of India. Innovative approaches for bundling insurance with other risk management strategies such as water management and disaster management are also being considered.
2. Building evidence for Climate-Smart Villages (CSV): The CSV concept and progress was noted by ISP in its last meeting. CCAFS South Asia is developing scientific evidence through multi-factorial field experiments, spreadsheet based tools, and simulation models to examine the value of the CSV concept, and the degree to which it achieves synergies between various CSA technologies and practices. Based on initial testimonials from farmers and policymakers, the Government of Maharashtra is proposing to set up 1000 CSVs for socially differentiated tribal regions. Similar scaling-out is happening in Nepal through PPP funded by IFC. Business models for promoting CSVs by involving farm producers' organizations and other community organizations are also being developed to fast-track scaling-out of CSA.

3. CSA-enabled development plans: CSA technologies have specific adaptation domains, costs and economic impacts, and their implementation requires appropriate investment decisions. Decision support tools are therefore needed that can assist different stakeholders to prioritize and hence take appropriate strategic interventions to transform agricultural practice to become climate-resilient, efficient and adaptive in a scenario of resource constraints, and considering current and future climatic risks. Several government stakeholders have shown a lot of interest in this. A CSA prioritization toolkit has been developed to support such decisions and is currently being evaluated for Bihar state in India and for Nepal and Bangladesh. Once validated, capacity of the national policy makers/advisors will be raised to utilize the outputs of the CSA prioritization to develop regionally and temporally differentiated participatory investment plans and also support the development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and Sub-National Adaptation Plans.

Based on the initial work the important lessons for us for scaling-out CSA are to engage the stakeholders, especially the governments and industry players from the beginning. The stakeholders expect CCAFS and other research organizations to provide evidence of success and the factors governing that rather than being involved in scaling-out. There are several opportunities for south-south learnings as well, some of which are in progress.

Decision:

- To note the good progress being made in scaling-out CSA and to reaffirm the need for CCAFS Flagship and Regional Program Leaders to engage stakeholders, especially governments and private sector, at the beginning of the research process to ensure rapid uptake

3.2 Global mitigation target and implications for priority setting in CCAFS

In 2014 CCAFS worked with 27 scientists from 17 agencies to establish a global aspirational target for mitigation in agriculture by 2030. Based on the best scientific evidence available, the group identified an aspirational goal to reduce agricultural greenhouse gas emissions by 12% (0.81 GtCO₂e/yr) and a conservative goal to reduce emissions by 6 to 8% (0.41 to 0.52 GtCO₂e/yr relative to estimated business-as-usual emissions of 6.59 GtCO₂e/yr in 2030). Reducing emissions by these quantities and assuming increased food production results in a decrease in emissions intensity of about 21%. The aspirational goal was set based on the estimated mitigation needed from the agricultural sector to stay within the 2°C goal, assuming that relative costs determine the distribution of mitigation effort across sectors. The feasible goal was set by using a historical adoption rate of 25% of an area for similar technologies that were widely adopted.

Additional goals were identified for mitigation related to agriculture:

- Reduce deforestation driven by agriculture to achieve reductions from 1.08-1.72 (conservative target) to 1.89-2.15 GtCO₂e/yr¹ (aspirational target).
- Increase tree cover on agricultural and other non-forest lands to achieve carbon sequestration of 0.39 to 0.47 GtCO₂/yr.

¹ Based on analysis from Havlík et al. (2014) and WUR-CIFOR; uses reference levels of 3.03 to 5.36 GtCO₂e/yr respectively See footnote 2 for details on reference level.

- Reduce food waste by 3.7 to 14% to achieve reductions of 0.39 to 2.00 GtCO₂e/yr.
- Reduce supply chain emissions for livestock sector by 18 to 30% if producers in a given system, region and climate adopted the production practices currently applied by the 10 to 25 percent of producers with the lowest emission intensity².
- Change dietary choices to reduce emissions by 0.09 to 0.11 GtCO₂e/yr.

Full details are available in the paper submitted to FAO for consideration by the Global Climate-Smart Agriculture Alliance (GACSA). An article is also in preparation for Science Policy Forum.

The analysis indicates the potential for achieving significantly higher reductions if emissions related to land cover change and the food system are included. The research needs are considerable for these additional areas, especially waste reduction and consumption. The issue is how deeply and broadly CCAFS should seek to engage in research for these additional sources of emissions at the cost of foregoing research on agriculture itself, where the needs are already considerable. The management team proposes that current efforts should be maintained at the level of about 80% of the budget through at least 2018 to complete the analysis of agricultural emissions and mitigation opportunities, including about 9% of the budget work on agriculture-driven deforestation. After 2018, a stronger emphasis on agriculture-driven deforestation, waste and consumption is warranted.

Decisions:

- To note that work on aspirational targets for climate change mitigation informs several efforts, including planning for CCAFS Phase 2, as well as for UNFCCC and the Global Alliance for ClimateSmart Agriculture.
- To scope the opportunities for CCAFS to include waste reduction, shifts in dietary preference and agriculture-related deforestation related to mitigation in its portfolio, recognizing existing work by other parties, CCAFS comparative advantage, the value of CCAFS' current portfolio and the need to weigh future opportunities against the value of CCAFS' existing work

3.3 Scenarios development: global and regional perspectives

Regional scenario engagement and development processes have been undertaken in all five CCAFS regions. While these processes are at different stages, they all involve development of participatory regional scenarios, working with a broad group of stakeholders to explore key regional socio-economic and governance uncertainties. The quantification of these narratives, and the combination of socio-economic scenarios with different climate scenarios and models, is done through two agricultural economic models: IFPRI's IMPACT model, designed to examine alternative futures for global food supply, demand, trade, prices, and food security, and IIASA's GloBiom model, designed to provide policy advice on global issues concerning land-use competition between the major land-based production sectors. The quantified scenarios, which describe different sets of key production, consumption, food system and environmental variables to the middle of the century, are being used to test and develop policies and investments with

² Based on analysis by Gerber et al. 2013. The livestock supply chain is the best documented and publicly available information. Food companies often calculate supply chains figures, but due to proprietary interests can be hard to secure.

decision makers at national and regional levels, to test research outcomes, for multi-level (local-national-regional) planning, and as case studies for global foresight (including in the IPCC Shared Socio-Economic Pathways).

The scenarios work in 2014 and 2015 is focusing on guiding specific policies in all five CCAFS regions, built around at least one major case study in each region. In West Africa, for example, the CCAFS scenarios team has been engaging with ECOWAS as well as with national policy makers, for instance to test policies in a multi-level planning workshop in Ghana together with the CCAFS Systemic Integrated Adaptation project. The Southeast Asian scenarios process was used to inform the Cambodian Climate Change Priorities Action Plan for Agriculture (CCPAP) and test FAO-led investment proposals in Climate-Smart Agriculture in Vietnam. In South Asia, the scenarios were used with the Bangladesh Planning Commission to help generate strategic content for the country's next Five Year Plan. In Latin America, policy guidance focuses on specific adaptation and agricultural development policies in Honduras and Peru. In East Africa, the scenarios have been used to test policy integration proposals in Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi. The East African scenarios are described in Vervoort et al., *The future of food security, environments and livelihoods in Eastern Africa: four socio-economic scenarios*, CCAFS Working Paper (2013), on-line at <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/34864>. A broad picture of the use of the scenarios in CCAFS activities is provided in Vervoort et al., *Challenges to scenario-guided adaptive action on food security under climate change*, published in *Global Environmental Change* (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.03.001>

Global-level engagement is being undertaken with a range of organizations, including FAO, UNEP, WCMC, Oxfam, IFAD, and OECD. This includes funded partnerships on multi-regional and national level policy and investment work; global research; and methodological guidance for internal programs. In 2015 a global synthesis is planned of all the regional scenarios work, resulting in a major research and policy paper. The scenarios team is also engaged in the global "Futures for AR4D in 2030" project being overseen by the CGIAR Consortium Office. The scenarios are being used as a prioritization tool for national decision-making, including being part of multi-scale evaluation of climate-smart practices, as well as in identifying plausible outcome targets for CCAFS flagships and regions to 2025. The cross-cutting scenarios work can help to integrate outcomes from other CCAFS activities in ways that makes those outcomes more relevant and understandable to key actors. The work involves close collaboration with a wide range of regional stakeholders (240 private and public organizations globally) as well as several of the CGIAR Centers. CCAFS is receiving frequent requests for training on scenario approaches, as there is considerable interest in some countries in forming scenario units in government. Such capacity building, via face-to-face training as well as online programs, will become an increasing focus as it may allow CCAFS to leave a lasting legacy that goes beyond specific policy guidance processes.

One question which the PMC is faced with concerns the degree to which a scenarios process should continue into Phase 2 of CCAFS. On the one hand, the process provides an excellent forum where multiple stakeholders involved with climate change and food security issues can meet to exchange perspectives. On the other hand, there are many such forums now that CCAFS is well developed, often focusing on more specific topics.

Decisions:

- To note the widespread engagement with national, regional and global partners, and commend the progress being made towards policy outcomes in the regions based on the CCAFS scenarios work
- To internalise the results of the scenarios work within CCAFS, using them for priority setting, multi-level trade-off analysis, and helping to define target indicators
- To encourage further exploration of how the CCAFS scenario method and approaches can inform CGIAR and Future Earth directions and approaches

3.4 Capacity enhancement

At its 4th meeting in May 2013, the ISP decided to ask the PMC to present new plans for capacity enhancement in Phase 2 of CCAFS, taking into account the CGIAR-wide initiative on capacity enhancement facilitated by the Consortium Office. CCAFS has taken the following actions: (1) an audit of all CCAFS capacity enhancement activities and outcomes since the program's inception; (2) participation in the CGIAR-wide initiative on capacity development; (3) strong inclusion of capacity enhancement in the CCAFS Extension Proposal, again as a mainstreamed rather than stand-alone activity. The audit of CCAFS capacity enhancement activities indicates that Themes, Regions and Centers have done well in terms of both capacity enhancement activities and in terms of outcomes where these have been documented via outcome case studies. The CGIAR-wide initiative shared a set of Draft Capacity Development Guidelines in June 2014 and held its annual Community of Practice Workshop in September 2014. CCAFS has participated in these processes. The draft Guidelines take a "systems" rather than a "training" perspective on capacity enhancement. They place emphasis on embedding capacity enhancement within CRPs' theories of change and impact pathways, propose nine elements of capacity for CRPs to consider, and commit the Community of Practice to improve CGIAR systems for monitoring and evaluating capacity enhancement. It is important for CCAFS to align with the Consortium Office, to apply the Guidelines in its plans for Phase 2, and to demonstrate leadership for other CRPs, for example on monitoring and evaluating of capacity enhancement.

Decisions:

- To note the achievements on capacity enhancement across CCAFS under the model in which capacity enhancement has been mainstreamed into the work of all Themes, Regions and Centers.
- Under Phase 2 of CCAFS to fully align capacity enhancement activities within the Flagship and Regional impact pathways, so that capacity enhancement activities contribute directly and coherently to CCAFS 2019 and 2025 targets and the IDOs.
- Under Phase 2 of CCAFS to ensure that capacity enhancement activities are captured within the CCAFS planning and reporting system to enable improved monitoring and evaluation.
- To ask the PMC to consider how CCAFS capacity enhancement activities can be further coordinated with other GCIAR activities and with major external efforts (including, where they exist, national level and regional level coordination platforms)

4) Extension Phase and Phase 2 of CGIAR Research Programs

The Extension Phase will run during 2015-2016, and Phase 2 starts in 2017. The Extension Phase proposals have been commented on by the Consortium Office and the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC). Revised Extension Phase proposals will now go to the Consortium Board and if approved on to the Fund Council for final approval in their November meeting. Phase 2 will have a two-stage proposal development process, with pre-proposals in 2015 and full proposals in 2016.

Since the last ISP meeting, CCAFS received comments on the extension proposal from the Consortium Office and ISPC. These were circulated to the ISP. As the whole proposal had to be only 15 pages, it was often difficult to include sufficient detail in the submitted version, and many of the ISPC comments were in relation to lack of sufficient detail. The Consortium Office was very positive, regarding the CCAFS proposal as one of the best. In the resubmission that was requested, CCAFS only had to address a few issues. CCAFS also took the opportunity of revising some of the targets in the proposal as we had managed to do further work with regions on targets and indicators.

CCAFS is now conducting the five regional planning workshops with partners, and revisiting targets to get multi-stakeholder buy-in. This may lead to further revisions of the targets, which hopefully can be accommodated in a final version of the extension proposal in November 2014. Another required part of the re-submission was a new “performance matrix” with targets for 2015 and 2016. These targets were based on the targets in the extension proposal, which had been set to 2019 (envisioning two years of Extension Phase, and the first three years of Phase 2).

CCAFS has been implementing a process to develop regional impact pathways and Flagship impact pathways. This kind of detail is impossible to put in the 15 page extension proposal, but is crucial for success and critical for developing the indicators and targets in the extension proposal. This has been an iterative process, starting already at the CCAFS meeting with CGIAR Contact Points in Davis in 2013, where the first set of regional targets was proposed. There has been iteration between Regions and Flagships and partners to get to where we are now and the process will be completed with the current regional planning meetings. These impacts pathways will be checked and revised if needed during subsequent planning cycles. The methodology devised for representing the impact pathways has been based on learning from the Results-Based Management trial for Flagship 4.

In tandem with the development of impact pathways has been the development of the web-based planning and reporting system (reported on in agenda item #5). This system links planning of activities with impact pathways, and also caters for reporting that is then also linked back to the impact pathways, and results-based management.

While all the above work has been put in place for the Extension Phase, the intention is that the same system rolls over into Phase 2, unless CGIAR changes its direction radically. The vision is that the projects now put in place will run for two years of the Extension Phase and two to three years of Phase 2.

It was noted that there are 2019 and 2025 targets in the extension proposal, with the 2019 targets generally related to uptake of the results by significant development actors (e.g. use of CCAFS tools in major development initiatives) while the 2025 results are more aligned to the Intermediate Development

Outcomes of the CGIAR (e.g. x million farmers with enhanced resilience). One comment from the ISPC was that the connection between the outputs, early targets and 2025 targets was not clear.

Decisions:

- To request the PMC to circulate the next set of comments on the Extension Proposal as soon as they come back from the Fund Council in November and to keep the ISP apprised of further revisions that will take place before the next ISP meeting.
- To note that the Extension Proposal will be the basis for the development of the Phase 2 proposal.
- To ask the Director to consult with the ISP members before submitting the pre-proposal. Also to note that there will be full discussion of this topic at the May meeting when further clarification has been received from the Consortium and Fund offices.
- To note that the full proposal will be informed by the CCAFS external evaluation.
- The ISP would like to see the detailed justification for the numbers in the 2025 targets and the detailed reasoning behind the connection between the 2019 and 2015 targets, as a means of validating the logic in the impact pathways.

5) Annual progress report on results-based management trial

In 2014, six Flagship Projects under Flagship Program 4, *Policies and institutions for climate-resilient food systems*, are part of a trial of results-based management (RBM). These consist of the following:

- Influencing and linking policies and institutions from national to local level for development and adoption of climate-resilient food systems (East Africa region, led by IITA).
- Transforming climate adaptation into a bottom-up development opportunity for West African smallholders (West Africa region, led by ICRISAT).
- Scaling up Climate Smart Agriculture through policies and institutions: Linking it with national agenda of food security (South Asia region, led by IFPRI).
- Addressing the Impacts of Climate Change in the Philippine Agriculture Sector (Southeast Asia region, led by IFPRI).
- Policy Information and Response Platform on Climate Change and Rice in ASEAN and its Member Countries (Southeast Asia region, led by IRRI).
- Relevant Climate Change Information meets Decision-Making to influence Policy and Institutions for Climate Resilient Food Systems (Latin America region, led by CIAT).

A process has been designed for the RBM of these projects. Each project has an impact pathway that fits with the overall Flagship 4 impact pathway, and outcome indicators have been developed. A draft M&E strategy for projects has been developed (see agenda item 7.2), and processes for self-reflection for more adaptive management, and a process to evaluate projects at the end of 2014 and to allocate a bonus pool, have been designed and are being implemented. Reporting for 2014 will be carried out using the new planning and reporting on-line system. A wiki has been set up (<http://ccafs-fp4-rbm-m-e-trial.wikispaces.com/>) and this stores a variety of learning resources, including a series of learning briefs on theory of change and impact pathways. Various face-to-face and virtual meetings have been organized with

project Principal Investigators during the year. A report on the RBM trial will be sent to the Consortium Office in early December. Two key lessons may be highlighted so far:

- The move from a log-frame approach to an outcome-orientated approach constitutes radical change. PMC has found no off-the-peg solutions to some of the challenges of implementation, highlighting the importance of collective learning. During the year, capacity development needs have been identified within and outside CCAFS, which we are attempting to address.
- Although it is time consuming to develop impact pathways at the project level and to ensure consistency with Flagship and regional impact pathways, PMC judges the effort to be worthwhile, because it can help provide clarity to work plans, cohesion to a portfolio of projects, and alignment in outcome indicators that can be aggregated across projects and regions.

Decisions:

- To note the progress being made in the RBM trial during 2014 and commend the considerable efforts being undertaken to make it work effectively.
- To request a presentation on the Planning and Reporting system, and how it links to Results-Based Management, at the next meeting

6) Priority setting

It is crucial to regularly reflect on what CCAFS is doing and what it should be doing. Targeting food security, poverty reduction and adaptation and mitigation options requires a strong ex- ante analytical capacity to diagnose points of vulnerability and assess the impacts and trade-offs between socioeconomic and environmental goals associated with alternative strategies. Major components of CCAFS involve foresight and scenario studies, vulnerability assessment and ex-ante impact assessment. These lead to specific opportunities that can be taken up and reflection by the management team about possible directions for research. Results Based Management also provides evidence of what is working and what is not, and suggests lines of research that should be phased out and others that could be scaled up. In Climate-Smart Villages, and in other site work, many activities are conducted through action research, where local stakeholders (including farmers) provide feedback as to directions of research that they want to include. The development of close partnerships from district to global level, as is encouraged in CCAFS, means that stakeholder priorities are considered when planning new activities. PMC believes the processes in place in CCAFS provides the needed inputs for making appropriate changes in direction.

At the higher programmatic level, questions remain as to whether we have the correct balance amongst Flagships and between regions, and within Flagships and regions whether the portfolio of activities is optimal. CCAFS is committed higher level priority setting activities going forward. For example, possibilities include:

- (a) An expert judgment process to assess whether the balance amongst Flagships and amongst regions is appropriate (e.g. the adaptation vs mitigation balance; ground level CSA practices vs policy level work).
- (b) Within Flagships, in consultation with the regions as appropriate, to develop papers that allow reflection on future research directions.

Decision:

- To request the PMC to come back in May 2015 with a more detailed proposal on how priority setting is going to be used to underpin the Flagship or Region research directions and report results to the CIAT BoT.

7) Update on CCAFS strategies

7.1 Implementation of the Data Management Strategy

The CCAFS Data Management Strategy (DMS) was developed in 2012. Its purpose is to help implement the open access policy of CGIAR and provide an enabling environment in which scientists and partners are able to produce and share high-quality data outputs throughout CCAFS, while at the same time enabling a variety of data management procedures and good practices at project level. This is achieved through “data portals” specifically designed for common types of data where scientists can publish their data and by the provision of guidance and support to scientists, CGIAR Centers and other CCAFS partners to facilitate producing well-managed and documented datasets that are easy to use both now and in the future.

The strategy covers several key areas, including accessibility and open access (now a CGIAR strategic objective), facilitating increased collaboration, ethical use and sharing of data, the provision of support for data generators, ensuring that credit and visibility go to those who generate data, and adherence to international standards for data storage. Implementation of the DMS is being guided by the Data Management Support Pack, which provides targeted resources for researchers and data managers to produce well-managed, high-quality and well-documented datasets that are easy to use, both now and into the future.

Various data portals, including Dataverse, the Adaptation and Mitigation Knowledge Network (AMKN), CCAFS-Climate.org (the GCM downscaled data portal), and the AgTrials database, serve as entry points for accessing the data that are being produced. The CCAFS DMS document itself has been downloaded nearly 400 times since 2013. Different elements of the DMS support pack are being downloaded by researchers, data managers and principal investigators from a range of both developed and developing countries. Recently, the CGIAR Consortium Office requested permission to utilize the CCAFS DMS support pack, seeing it as a ground-breaking model for other Centers and CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) to follow. The other key tool for implementing the DMS is the CCAFS planning and reporting system, in which projects enumerate data deliverables in planning and then report on these, together with quality indicators and web locators for easy access. The planning and reporting system, still under development, is being used for planning 2015 activities, and the full system (both planning and reporting) will be used for the 2015-2016 cycle. It will include a “traffic light” evaluation procedure to ensure that high-value data sets are appropriately stored, documented and disseminated. Several CRPs have expressed interest in using (and possibly adapting) the CCAFS planning and reporting system.

Decision:

- To endorse current implementation plans for the CCAFS Data Management Strategy, and to commend its uptake by the Consortium Office as a model of good practice.

7.2 Project M&E strategy

The CCAFS Strategy for Priority Setting, Monitoring and Evaluation was last laid out for the ISP in 2012, at ISP3. It covered priority setting, work planning and reporting, and evaluating research outcomes in terms of ex-post impact assessment. As discussed above, in 2015 CCAFS will be in an Extension Phase, moving to Phase 2 in 2017, along with a shifting focus from research outputs to research outcomes (changes in people's practices and behavior). This shift in focus requires that a number of systems be in place to allow successful implementation, including a modified Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system for projects.

The proposal is that this be organized around two key documents: an M&E strategy document, and an M&E support pack, similar to the Data Management Strategy (DMS). A draft M&E strategy has been developed, in response to the Results Based Management (RBM) trial being undertaken during 2014 by CCAFS Flagship 4. RBM will be extended to all CCAFS activities in 2015, and the draft M&E strategy is designed to be applicable across the program. The M&E support pack is currently being developed, and will be available online and (like the DMS support pack) will be targeted at different types of users. It will contain elements such as training materials on how to develop impact pathways and theories of change, and tools for measuring progress, learning and change; options for project assessment and bonus allocation; the design of baselines; and references and a wide variety of resource material. From a practical standpoint, key elements of the M&E strategy are being implemented in the CCAFS planning and reporting system. It is envisaged that the planning and reporting system will eventually function as an adaptive management tool.

Decisions:

- To endorse the draft project M&E strategy and support pack, and commend progress on the CCAFS on-line planning and reporting system.
- To note that the broader CCAFS paper on program-wide priority setting, monitoring and evaluation, and learning will need to be updated in the light of the changes made in the extension phase.

8) Reflection on draft decisions from 30 October

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

9)

Decision:

- To revise the draft decisions from 30 October.

Major risks to CCAFS

As in previous years, CCAFS management team reflected on the major risks it faces and updated the risk management catalogue (following the same format as that used by CIAT). The four top-rated risks were as follows:

- (a) **CCAFS not delivering on outcomes and impacts due to high expectations.** CCAFS needs to rethink impact pathways, as is now happening, and ensure they are communicated and discussed amongst partners. PMC needs to apply constant pressure on Center partners to recognise the urgency of delivering on outcomes. The CCAFS PMC needs to reflect at the end of 2014 on the impact assessments received, and whether they are meeting expectations.
- (b) **Weak commitment or capacity of CGIAR Centers to deliver climate change science given the increased number of CRPs and incorporation of climate change issues in the current CRPs.** CCAFS PMC needs on-

going effort in the performance management system, so that any weakness in delivery is reflected in future funding levels, and good delivery is rewarded. CCAFS PMC must examine the Programs of Work and Budget of other CRPs to ensure that they do not address climate change issues in a manner which results in extreme overlap.

(c) **Funding instability from year to year and going into Phase 2.** Given the Finance Plan proposed by the Consortium, CCAFS expects relative stability through the Extension Phase, but going into Phase 2 it is entirely uncertain what becomes of CCAFS in its current form. CCAFS PMC needs a major push to strengthen fundraising, including securing Window 2 funds, raising bilaterals and leveraging externally. CCAFS needs regular dialogue with the Consortium Office.

(d) **Lack of global consensus on climate change and continuing deadlock at the UNFCCC results in a lack of interest in funding for climate research.** CCAFS PMC recognises that there is a constant need at the global level to bring out new scientific studies, with associated communication strategies, showing the impact of climate change and the effective options for addressing climate change. Given the recent progress (June 2014) at the UNFCCC SBSTA this risk may be declining.

Decisions:

- To prepare a summary presentation for the May 2015 ISP meeting of all impact assessments conducted
- To update the risk catalogue in relation to: Need for clarity in the way risk owners are defined, to adjust the mitigation column, to revise risk owners statement
- To note suggested changes for 2015 and the ISP will consider the risk catalogue in each of the meetings
- The Coordinating Unit to ask for confirmation from Centres that ethics approval procedures are in place and inform ISP of the results..

10) External evaluations

10.1 Draft report for the CCEE evaluation of Theme 3

The topic was briefly discussed and some concern expressed that the evaluation was delayed and conducted by only one individual.

Decision:

- To request the PMC to pursue additional specialists to join the reference group based on an identification of gaps based on a draft of the report; followed by a virtual meeting.

10.2 Update on upcoming evaluation and audit

10.2.1 Full 2015 IEA evaluation of CCAFS

As discussed by ISP in May a full program evaluation of CCAFS in 2015 will be undertaken by the CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA). CCAFS is still awaiting final ToR. However, CCAFS has been approached by the IEA for preparatory discussions. PMC has provided input for evaluators, reference group (will consist of 6-9 people – Center scientists, lead Center Board, partners, key stakeholders, donors) as well as background material on CCAFS in general and previous evaluations. Meetings between Simon Anderson

and ISP members as well as the PMC have been set up while ISP and PMC are in Washington DC. A tentative timeline for the evaluation has been developed:

- Inception phase November-January, including inception meeting. The output is the Inception Report that lays down the plan (the “Road Map”) for the evaluation.
- Inquiry phase with site visits February-May
- Report writing June-August

Decision:

- To note the update.

10.2.2 Update on Internal Audit

In August the Internal Audit Unit of the CGIAR contacted CCAFS to inform that CCAFS was due for an internal audit. This had been expected in 2013 but it had been postponed. The internal audit appears to be a relatively major exercise, and CCAFS management has asked the audit team to coordinate with the IEA so that there is no major overlap in the evaluations. The Internal Audit Unit focusses on the following issues:

- Governance, Management, and Compliance
- Financial Management
- Project Management
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Partners and Subcontractor Management

The first meeting with the internal audit unit took place in Copenhagen in the week before the ISP meeting.

Decision:

- To note the update

10.3 Bibliometric analysis

At its last meeting ISP asked that CCAFS conduct a bibliometric analysis. CCAFS PMC has examined some bibliometric analyses that have been done for the Consortium Office by major publishing companies and has concluded that they have some serious flaws (e.g. the lists of publications generated through the search engines only identified a percentage of the actual output from CCAFS). PMC thus proposes that the starting point for a bibliometric analysis should be the list of publications in the CCAFS annual report.

The proposed Terms of Reference will include the following:

- a) Using the 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 CCAFS annual reports, prepare a master list of CCAFS publications for analysis.
- b) The analysis should examine the following issues:
 - i. Productivity in relation to budget for Centers, Themes, Regions
 - ii. Publication quality using various indices
 - iii. Degree to which publications include partners from national research agencies, advanced research agencies, private sector
 - iv. Degree to which publications reflect multi-Center collaboration

Decisions:

- To recommend further discussions with IEA in setting up the analysis to ensure that it can

provide input to the external evaluation of CCAFS.
- To request that the bibliometric results be presented to the May 2015 ISP meeting.

11) Plan of Work and Budget (POWB) 2015

11.1 Overview

The Extension Phase starting in 2015 has a much more focused agenda, as a result of the process conducted from 2013 into 2014 involving: soliciting concept notes, selecting concept notes, and developing high priority “Flagship Projects” that cut across Centres and are integrated into regional plans. Many of these projects build on past efforts and the overall framework used in Phase 1 has many similarities to what will be conducted in the Extension Phase. The major differences in the overall framework were discussed at the previous ISP meeting. Well aligned and outcome-orientated work has been scaled up and low priority work has been removed. The big differences in the Extension Phase are: (a) the extra attention placed on impact pathways and indicators of progress, against which all projects will report; (b) much greater regional integration of activities; (c) closer alignment of activities to strategy.

Some work conducted in Phase 1 that is near completion but was not selected for funding in the Extension Phase and Phase 2 needs to be completed. These so-called bridging activities are budgeted at S\$1.798 Million. They will all be completed by the end of 2015.

The Plan of Work and Budget (POWB) is in draft format, as we have not yet had instructions from the Consortium Office on the format for 2015, and because regional planning workshops are on-going and will be important in terms of fine-tuning the 2015 workplan. One item that is missing is the plan for work on gender and social inequality; it will be completed after the regional planning workshops are complete.

Decisions:

- To note the draft Program of Work for 2015.
- To note the importance of including both gender and social differentiation as a cross-cutting issue.

11.2 Flagship and regional priorities

The major outcomes sought in 2015 are as follows (still under discussion in the regional planning meetings). A number of these are based on on-going initiatives; nonetheless the targets are rather demanding. Each target is backed up by plan to achieve the target; with identified projects and individuals responsible. We have factored into these plans the chance of failure in achieving outcomes in projects (in other words we will over-perform if all plans are successful).

Flagship Project 1: Climate-smart agricultural practices
4 national (or subnational in the case of India) major development initiatives (with targets of at least 50,000 beneficiaries) and public institutions prioritize and inform project implementation of equitable best bet CSA options using CCAFS science and decision support tools
2 public-private actors at national and subnational levels are using new incentive mechanisms and business models that explicitly promote equitable climate smart approaches along the value chain, using CCAFS science
Flagship Project 2: Climate information services and climate-informed safety nets

2 major regional, national, and sub-national institutions develop or improve major demand-driven, equitable, climate informed services supporting rural communities using CCAFS research outputs
US\$ 2 million increase, relative to 2014, in research-informed demand-driven investments in climate services for agriculture and food security decision-making, based on CCAFS science and engagement
Flagship Project 3: : Low-emissions agricultural development
1 low emissions plan developed for implementation, based on CCAFS science, that has significant mitigation potential, i.e. will contribute to a reduction of at least 5% GHG emissions intensities or reach at least 10,000 farmers, including at least 10% women
0.3 million hectares targeted by research-informed initiatives for scaling up low-emissions agriculture and preventing deforestation
Flagship Project 4: Policies and institutions for climate-resilient food systems
2 equitable national/subnational food system policies enacted that take into consideration climate smart practices and strategies, informed using knowledge, tools and approaches derived from CCAFS science
1 regional/global organisation informs their equitable institutional investments in climate smart food systems using CCAFS outputs

In 2015 Flagship 1 will prioritize the production of a compendium of climate-smart agricultural practices, with associated costs, benefits and constraints to adoption. It plans to ensure that the decision support tools that are being produced will be used to prioritize CSA investments in at least 4 major development initiatives.

In 2015 Flagship 2 will focus on the production of methods and tools to use climate information for farm and food security decision-making. Its goal for 2015 is to use CCAFS outputs to significantly shape at least two major national or regional climate services initiatives that benefit rural communities.

Flagship 3 will produce in 2015 comparable, robust estimates of emissions from major smallholder systems, and decision tools for integrated analysis. It plans to ensure science-informed national planning of mitigation priorities in at least four countries.

In 2015 Flagship 4 will produce improved decision tools to model agricultural impacts and prioritize investment choices. It hopes to see enhanced knowledge and use of CCAFS outputs by technical next users in at least 2 countries. CCAFS will strengthen engagement with the CSA Alliance, including key development partners like IFAD and the World Bank.

In West Africa, the focus will be to expand the scaling up of climate services to guide farm management decision making through various channels such as the Union of Rural Community Radios in Senegal, the SMS and call center communication approach of Esoko (www.esoko.com) in Ghana, and the agricultural value chain programs in Burkina and Senegal. As a follow up to CCAFS technical backstopping on CSA during the farmers' university of the West Africa Farmers Network (ROPPA), pilot tests on CSV models will be implemented with ROPPA national platforms in West Africa. CCAFS will support the development of

national action plans for agriculture in Ghana and in Senegal through the National science-policy dialogue platforms.

In East Africa, focus will be on strengthening the participatory action research platforms and monitoring and documentation for CSA options in three CSV sites. In Kenya work will take place with the county governments and Ministry of Agriculture together with Unique Forestry and Land Use to develop guidelines for quantification and monitoring of GHG. Through the CSA Alliance and other emerging partnerships we will support the development of a framework for at least one country CSA program.

In South Asia, work will take place to scale-out Climate-Smart Agriculture in the region; develop improved products for crop insurance; and use the newly developed decision support systems to formulate CSA-enabled development/investment plans at sub-national/national level.

In Southeast Asia the focus will be on organizing the CSVs that have been selected in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and linking them with national programs. The regional program will engage policy people and media practitioners to increase awareness and mobilize actions promoting CSA. The regional program will also continue supporting the development and implementation of the national action plans on climate change for agriculture in Cambodia and Myanmar through linkage with possible donors.

In Latin America CCAFS will work with CIAT on scaling out the CSA prioritization tool piloted in Guatemala in at least one more country in the region while providing best bet context-specific CSA practices through extension services, e.g. CSA rice cropping approaches in Colombia. Bioversity, CIAT and CIP will help CCAFS to generate tailored agro-climate information for informing decision-making cycles in Colombia and Guatemala while the International Research Center on Climate and Society will work on testing an index insurance prototype in Honduras. CIAT and ICRAF will work on NAMAs development and implementation in Costa Rica and Colombia and in GHG measurement in Nicaragua and Honduras. Another priority for Latin America would be the implementation and use of socioeconomic scenarios to assess agricultural policies in Peru and Honduras.

The changes made in the portfolio have meant that certain Centers have seen an increased level of activity, while others have seen a decrease. The PMC regards the shifts in activities and budget as an appropriate reflection of the strategic needs of CCAFS. Two potentially problematic issues are: (a) an absence of rice research in Africa; and (b) fisheries and aquaculture may be under-represented in the portfolio.

Decisions:

- To approve the targets and indicators noting that if these change significantly as a result of the regional planning workshops, the new targets be circulated to the ISP for comments before the end of the year.
- To request that PMC includes the following two issues in the forthcoming priority setting exercises: absence of CCAFS rice research in Africa, and limited fisheries and aquaculture research in the portfolio.

11.3 Cross-cutting issues

The Coordinating Unit and specified individuals in the management team will be responsible for various cross-cutting issues. Support to achieving the goals of impact pathways will be provided by the following sets of activities.

(a) Communications and events

Building on the strategy of 2014, the focus will be on a few major global events, but priority will be given to strengthening outreach around key products and processes in the regions. The major events at global level will be the Climate Smart Agriculture conference in Montpellier in March 2015, the Gender and Climate Change event in Paris (with ISSC and Future Earth, March), Climate Change Science Conference (Future Earth and UNESCO, July) and COP21 (Paris, December). At regional level, key priorities are to support (either remotely or on the ground) the West Africa regional meeting on mainstreaming climate change into sectoral policies in May; the regional climate change adaptation and food security policy conference in Tanzania in June; the workshop on Gender and Climate Change Policy for Latin America in June; Southeast Asia Impact of climate change on Asian Food Systems in July 2015 and help promote the combined South Asia and Southeast Asia event in November focusing on Climate-Smart Agriculture.

(b) Synthesis, partnerships, capacity strengthening

In 2015, two major synthesis products are envisaged for feeding into the UNFCCC SBSTA discussions on agriculture (one on pests and diseases; and the other on early warning systems), and a white paper will be produced on climate change and agriculture for the French Presidency of COP21. The request for such a paper comes from a meeting between the COP21 President and the Consortium Office. A first version of the paper will be produced this year for discussion at COP20 in Lima. Based on feedback, the document will be updated for COP21.

(c) Gender Leadership

The to-be appointed gender leader will revisit the gender strategy of CCAFS, reinvigorate the gender network within CCAFS, provide intellectual leadership for the Paris gender meeting, and pay particular attention to ensuring that CCAFS can measure progress towards the gender Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO).

Other cross-cutting issues relate to Management and Governance. On data management, CCAFS will position itself as a leader in data management across CGIAR, and in 2015 will interact closely with the Consortium Office efforts on data. Work to be completed in 2015 includes: the design and implementation of appropriate tools to monitor data/tools usage for M&E purposes; and the definition and establishment of a strategy for prioritization of data and deliverables for dissemination. The CCAFS data manager will continue to interact with scientists within CGIAR and beyond, and support them on issues related to data access and management, including the production of quality data that can be archived and published via CCAFS platforms.

2015 will be the first year of the new M&E process. Baselines will need to be put in place for the indicators that have been selected, and the planning and reporting system needs to be tested for its reporting function. Based on the experience at the end of 2014, the system will be revised in mid-2015. The PMC will continue to meet monthly by video and twice annually face-to-face, and two meetings of the ISP are

planned.

Decisions:

- To note with appreciation the development of a white paper for COP 20 and 21.
- To prioritize the CSA conference in Montpellier in March 2015 as a major collaborative event.
- To approve the plans related to cross-cutting issues.
- To request that the plan measuring progress towards the gender IDO be presented at the next ISP meeting; and
- To request the PMC to provide the ISP with an annual diary of important events.

11.4 State of 2014 budget and expenditure

The Director noted that since the preparation of the background papers for the meeting, the Consortium had announced a budget cut for 2014 and 2015 – this amounted to about 7% of the 2014 budget and 14% of the 2015 budget.

To put the 2015 budget discussions in perspective, an update on the 2014 budget, expenditure as of June 30th, year-end expenditure forecast and cash flow status was given.

Since the ISP meeting in May when an update of the 2014 budget was presented, CCAFS has made some adjustments as follows:

- Following the approval in May 2014 to distribute the \$1Million extra funds from 2013 budget to priority and additional activities in 2014, PMC has by June 2014 allocated these funds to all Partners and incorporated them in the Biannual Financial Report at 30th June 2014.
- PMC approved \$1.22 Million to cover over execution from 2013 Financial Report.
- The above adjustments and 2013 carryover increased the overall 2014 budget from \$74.02 Million to \$77.3 Million.
- PMC has incorporated into the Partners Financial Reports over/under expenditure for all partners in the 2014 Budget & Expenditure Report as of June 2014.

Decisions:

- To note the update and express great concern regarding the unacceptably late decision to cut the 2014 budget.
- To support the PMC in their decision to cut each budget holder in proportion to their CCAFS W1/W2 budget, as the method to deal with the 2014 cut. Budget holders are urged to cut expenditure and/or carry forward a negative balance into 2015. Budget holders are requested to report back on any drastic effects on outputs and outcomes that may result.
- To recommend consideration of budget formats for presentation to future ISP meetings.

11.5 2015 budget

Since the last ISP/ PMC meetings in May 2014, PMC has dedicated its time in building the 2015 Portfolio. PMC has assumed a W1, 2 &3 budget of \$51.4 million (\$48.4 million W1&2 and \$3 million W3), divided amongst Centers/Flagships/Regional Program Leaders/Coordinating Unit. The W1&2 budget is based on the financial plan of the Consortium Office that specifies this amount for CCAFS, while the W3 amount is

based on the on-going contract with the European Commission. The budget presented is based on the information supplied by the various partners through the Planning and Reporting System (this does not include detailed budgeting using the “natural classification” budget lines – personnel, travel etc.). After the ISP meeting detailed budgets will be prepared by all partners.

Some of the key items to note in the budget are:

- 71% of the total budget of \$68.101million is expected to be financed with Window 1&2 funds. This W1&2 budget is about the same as the W1&2 budget in the revised 2014 total budget of \$77.3 million (including the extra allocation from 2013 budget).
- The bilateral is \$2 Million less than that in 2014. This is still an assumption based on initial estimates from Centers. We expect a decrease from 2014 because of the heavy emphasis on strategic fit during the selection process for activities to be funded in the Extension Phase, which thus excluded some bilateral projects.
- Funds going to partners are estimated at 22% out of the total 2015 flagship portfolio. This is problematic, given the CCAFS target on this budget line.
- 29% of the CCAFS budget is intended for Flagship 1- Climate Smart Practices, 14% to Flagship 2- Climate Information Services, 13% to Flagship 3-Low- emissions agricultural development, 17% to Flagship 4- Policies and Institutions, 20% support to impact pathways (communications, synthesis, partnerships etc.), 4% to Management and Governance (including data management and M&E) and the Innovation fund is only 3% in 2015. For 2015 the Innovation Fund has been reduced in order to make a pool of funds for bridging activities, as presented in a previous agenda item. The PMC reasoned that for 2015, highly strategic, well-performing and innovative Centers will be rewarded by budget increases through the newly created portfolio, thus diminishing the need for an Innovation Fund in 2015.
- From the regional perspective, the budget has been distributed as follows: 21% to East Africa, 11% to West Africa, 12% to South Asia, 13% to South East Asia, 16% to Latin America, 15% to Global & Others, 5% to Support to Impact Pathway, 4% to Management & Governance (including data and M&E), 3% to Innovation and Knowledge partnership fund.
- The gender budget has still to be done through the detailed budgeting process.

Because of the process that was followed to select concept notes, budgets of Centers have changed significantly from 2014 into 2015.

We have recently been told by the Consortium Office that the 2015 Financial Plan is too optimistic, and that a budget cut of 14% in 2015 should be expected.

This adjustment will bring down W1&2 Budget from US\$48.4 Million to US\$38.7 Million.

Decisions:

- To approve the request to allocate some funds to bridging activities, recognising that these will be completed by December 2015.
- To approve the budget in principle and request the PMC to circulate the revised budget incorporating necessary budget cuts for ISP agreement to recommend to the CIAT BoT for

approval.

12) Chair's annual report to CIAT Board of Trustees

The Chair will attend the 70th CIAT BoT meeting at CIAT in Cali on 18-21 November 2014 and present his annual report. The Director will participate via video/telephone link.

Chuck Rice will report from the ISP meeting and specifically address the CCEE on Theme 3 and the full external evaluation of CCAFS in 2015 led by the CGIAR Internal Evaluation Arrangement (IEA).

He will give a brief report on recent important developments, including the formal launch of the Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture at the UN in September and the CGIAR Development Dialogue in New York.

CCAFS and Future Earth held a meeting in October to explore possibilities for a major new food systems initiative.

The Chair will present the 2015 CCAFS Plan of Work and Budget for approval. This will include a status update on preparations for the Extension Phase 2015-2016 and progress on preparing for the CCAFS Phase 2 (2017 -).

The issue of boundaries amongst CRPs has been discussed by the PMC. Early indications are that the numbers of CRPs will change in the second round, and early text in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) points to climate change becoming a cross-cutting issue or a platform. There is still lack of clarity what the future holds in terms of CRPs, so rather than solve a short term issue of boundaries amongst CRPs the PMC proposed that further discussion be postponed until the future CRP structure is clear.

He will note that the planned competitive fund has been postponed until 2016 and an initiative has been taken to streamline CCAFS and Center human resource planning.

He will propose a new member of ISP following the resignation of Lindiwe Majele Sibanda.

He will also offer some experiences from his six years as Chair of the CCAFS Challenge Program Steering Committee and CCAFS CRP Independent Science Panel.

Decision:

- To note the planned report by the Chair to CIAT BoT.

13) Discussion of new ISP members

Discussions of new members normally take place at May meetings. However, Lindiwe Sibanda stepped down in September 2014 and so a discussion of her replacement was required at this meeting.

In line with the CCAFS Program Plan, appointment of new members and re-appointment of current members will be done by the CIAT BoT on the basis of input from a Nomination Committee consisting of

the CIAT Director General (who has been delegated the responsibility of being the CGIAR representative and further delegated this to the BoT representative on ISP), the Future Earth representative, and the ISP Chair. As the current ISP Chair will step down by the end of 2014 the upcoming Chair has joined the Nomination Committee. The decision on a new member will be taken by the CIAT BoT at its meeting in November.

The current Chair, the upcoming Chair and Program Director have made an initial screening and the remaining candidates are presented to the ISP for discussion in order to find a profile that can match that of Lindiwe Sibanda.

Decision:

- To propose a candidate as ISP member from 2015 for consideration by the Nomination Committee.

14) Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings

The following topics, previously prioritized by the ISP or emerging from this meeting, should be presented at the May 2015 and November 2015 meeting:

- Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO (May)
- Private sector engagement: update (May)
- Presentation on the on-line planning and reporting system and a demonstration of how it links into results-based management (May)
- Summary analysis of all impact assessments conducted; including a forward looking analysis of opportunities for large scale impact (May)
- Update on the Phase 2 proposal, and in particular how cross CRP-linkages can be fostered, and how the concept of CSA is being articulated in relation to other concepts (e.g. sustainable intensification)
- Presentation on the logic connecting the 2019 and 2025 targets, and justification for the targets selected (May).
- Results of the bibliometric study of the IPCC report in relation to CGIAR role (May)
- Internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas (Nov)
- Report back on priority setting exercises (Nov)
-
- Bibliometric analysis of CCAFS publications (Nov)
- Climate information services: downscaling, reaching users, integrating with other agricultural advisories

In addition, other topics that are important to cover either in the next meetings or in 2016, include:

- Institutions and incentives for low emissions development
- Progress in Flagship 2 in getting synergies across CGIAR Centers
- Linking knowledge and action: status and outlook
- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy

Decision:

- To agree that the Chair and Director should consider topics to be covered in the May meeting.

15) Future meetings, including date and place for the 8th and 9th meetings

Based on Doodle feedback from ISP members, it was proposed to hold the 8th meeting on 8-9 May 2015 in Kenya, and to organize an optional field trip on 7 May; and to hold the 9th meeting on 5-6 November 2015 in Cali, Colombia back-to-back with the CIAT BoT meeting (9-11 November), and to organize an optional field trip on 4 November for those members available.

Decisions:

- To hold the 8th ISP meeting on 8-9 May in Kenya with a field trip on 7 May.
- To hold the 9th meeting on 5-6 November possibly in South Asia.

16) ISP self-assessment

16.1 Results of the ISP self-assessment from the 6th meeting

ISP discussed the results of the self-assessment from the 6th meeting. The assessment form focused on seven questions, some with sub-questions. Each question allowed for open-ended comments. The form was completed anonymously.

Overall there was a high degree of satisfaction among ISP members with the work of the ISP, its chair and the PMC. ISP members specifically commended the chair's and the PMC's work and acknowledged the good, yet difficult, balance in the agenda of programmatic vs. management topics; and big-picture vs. detail

The one question with the lowest satisfaction score and the highest number of comments was Q3:

"Indicate agreement with the following

- There is an effective system to ensure that the emerging results from ex ante analysis are leading to strategic allocation of resources.*
- The ISP effectively uses emerging results from priority setting exercises and feeds them into the decisions and recommendations it is making about resource allocation."*

Comments on this question highlighted that members feel more could be done to ensure that results of ex-ante analyses (a) are actually conducted and (b) their results form part of the information available to ISP members, on which to base decisions and set priorities.

Decision:

- To note the results of the self-assessment from the 6th meeting.

16.2 Revised ISP self-assessment form

As decided by ISP at the last meeting the Vice Chair has prepared a revised ISP self-assessment form. He elaborated on the most important characteristics and the main differences from the previous form. Members were encouraged to check it before the meeting.

Decision:

- To approve the revised ISP self-assessment form.

17) Any other business

Brian Keating noted that Thomas Rosswall, Mary Scholes and Holger Meinke will rotate off the ISP by the end of 2014. They have been with CCAFS since 2009, on the CCAFS Challenge Program Steering Committee from 2009 and on the ISP from 2011. Lindiwe Sibanda joined ISP in 2011 and stepped down in September 2014. He thanked them all for their long service and highly valuable contributions to CCAFS and wished them the very best for the future.

18) Closed meeting with Program Director

19) Closed meeting without management

20) Closed meeting without management and Chair

Thomas Rosswall
Chair

Bruce Campbell
Director

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

CCAFS ISP7/2.1.1 Agenda
CCAFS ISP7/2.1.2 Annotated agenda
CCAFS ISP7/2.1.3 List of acronyms and abbreviations
CCAFS ISP7/2.2.1 Minutes from the 6th CCAFS ISP meeting
CCAFS ISP7/2.2.2 Status on follow-ups from previous meeting
CCAFS ISP7/2.3.1 CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (draft))
CCAFS ISP7/3.1.1 Climate-Smart Agriculture in South Asia [PowerPoint Presentation]
CCAFS ISP5/3.2.1 Reducing emissions from agriculture by 2030: An aspirational target
CCAFS ISP7/3.2.2 Aspirational target for mitigation of agricultural emissions [PowerPoint Presentation]
CCAFS ISP5/3.2.3 Aspirational targets for Flagship 3 2025 outcome indicators in CCAFS regions
CCAFS ISP7/3.3.1 Scenarios development and utilization: global and regional perspectives [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/3.4.1 Audit of CCAFS capacity enhancement activities 2011-2014
CCAFS ISP7/3.4.2 CGIAR Draft Capacity Development Guidelines
CCAFS ISP7/3.4.3 [CCAFS capacity enhancement review and plans for Phase 2](#) [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/4.1 Revised CCAFS Proposal
CCAFS ISP7/4.2 Cover letter to Consortium with response to comments
CCAFS ISP7/4.3 Performance matrix
CCAFS ISP7/4.4 CCAFS Impact Pathways
CCAFS ISP7/5.1 Summaries of the Flagship 4 Results-based Management Trial Projects
CCAFS ISP7/5.2 Annual progress report on the results-based management trial [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/7.1.1 Data management strategy
CCAFS ISP7/7.1.2 Data management support pack, online at <http://ccafs.cgiar.org/data-management-support-pack>
CCAFS ISP7/7.1.3 Implementation of the Data Management Strategy [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/7.2.1 Draft CCAFS Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
CCAFS ISP7/7.2.2 CCAFS M&E strategy [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/9.1 CCAFS Risk catalogue
CCAFS ISP7/10.1.1 CV lead evaluator Gordon Smith
CCAFS ISP7/10.1.2 Draft report for evaluation of CCAFS Theme 3 [available on 24 October]
CCAFS ISP7/11.1 CCAFS Plan of Work and Budget 2015
CCAFS ISP7/11.1.1 Titles and budgets for bridging activities
CCAFS ISP7/11.4.1 and 11.5.2 Financial update [Power Point Presentation]
CCAFS ISP7/11.5.1 Budget 2015
CCAFS ISP7/11.5.3 Budget changes to Centers
CCAFS ISP7/13.1 Possible ISP candidates (confidential)
CCAFS ISP7/16.1.1 Results of the ISP self-assessment from the 7th meeting
CCAFS ISP7/16.2.1 Revised ISP self-assessment form

Annex 1

Follow-up actions from Washington meeting on 30-31 October, 2014

2.1 Adoption of agenda

- To postpone agenda item 10.1 “Draft report for the CCEE evaluation of Theme 3” until the next meeting

2.2 Minutes and follow-ups on previous meetings and matters arising

- To request a report back from the management on how Centers reacted to the visits to facilitate CCAFS-Center relationships, including CCAFS-relevant human resources planning.
- To note that issue of an internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas will be returned to in late 2015, ready for implementation in 2016.
- To request that the results of the bibliometric study of the IPCC report in relation to CGIAR role be presented at the next ISP meeting

2.3 Updates from *ex officio* members

- To request the Beddington CGIAR Mid-term Review to be circulated to ISP members
- To circulate the Future Earth strategic research agenda to the ISP, when ready.
- To discuss Future Earth – CCAFS interactions once the Future Earth strategic research agenda has been finalised
- To prepare within the next couple of weeks a quarter/half page briefing summary to the CIAT Board Chair of status of the climate change and food security portfolio of CGIAR as seen from CCAFS perspective

3.4 Capacity enhancement

- To ask the PMC to consider how CCAFS capacity enhancement activities can be further coordinated with other GCIAR activities and with major external efforts (including, where they exist, national level and regional level coordination platforms)

4 Extension Phase and Phase 2 of CGIAR Research Programs

- To request the PMC to circulate the next set of comments on the Extension Proposal as soon as they come back from the Fund Council in November and to keep the ISP apprised of further revisions that will take place before the next ISP meeting.
- To ask the Director to consult with the ISP members before submitting the pre-proposal. Also to note that there will be full discussion of this topic at the May meeting when further clarification has been received from the Consortium and Fund offices.
- The ISP would like to see the detailed justification for the numbers in the 2025 targets and the detailed reasoning behind the connection between the 2019 and 2015 targets, as a means of validating the logic in the impact pathways.

5 Annual progress report on results-based management trial

- To request a presentation on the Planning and Reporting system, and how it links to Results-Based Management, at the next meeting.

6 Priority setting

- To request the PMC to come back in May 2015 with a more detailed proposal on how priority setting is going to be used to underpin the Flagship or Region research directions and report results to the CIAT BoT.

9 Major risks to CCAFS

- To prepare a summary presentation for the May 2015 ISP meeting of all impact assessments conducted
- To update the risk catalogue in relation to: Need for clarity in the way risk owners are defined, to adjust the mitigation column, to revise risk owners statement
- The Coordinating Unit to ask for confirmation from Centres that ethics approval procedures are in place and inform ISP of the results.

10.1 Draft report for the CCEE evaluation of Theme 3

- To request the PMC to pursue additional specialists to join the reference group based on an identification of gaps based on a draft of the report; followed by a virtual meeting.

10.3 Bibliometric analysis

- To request that the bibliometric results be presented to the May 2015 ISP meeting.

11.2 Flagship and regional priorities

- To approve the targets and indicators noting that if these change significantly as a result of the regional planning workshops, the new targets be circulated to the ISP for comments before the end of the year.
- To request that PMC includes the following two issues in the forthcoming priority setting exercises: absence of CCAFS rice research in Africa, and limited fisheries and aquaculture research in the portfolio.

11.3 Cross-cutting issues

- To request that the plan measuring progress towards the gender IDO be presented at the next ISP meeting; and
- To request the PMC to provide the ISP with an annual diary of important events.

11.4 State of 2014 budget and expenditure

- To support the PMC in their decision to cut each budget holder in proportion to their CCAFS W1/W2 budget, as the method to deal with the 2014 cut. Budget holders are urged to cut expenditure and/or carry forward a negative balance into 2015. Budget holders are requested to report back on any drastic effects on outputs and outcomes that may result.
- To recommend consideration of budget formats for presentation to future ISP meetings.

11.5 2015 budget

- To approve the budget in principle and request the PMC to circulate the revised budget incorporating necessary budget cuts for ISP agreement to recommend to the CIAT BoT for approval.

Follow-up actions from Managua meeting on 20-21 May, 2014

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

- To send the conflict of interest disclosure form to Torben Timmermann by 10 June 2014

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

- To request a timeline for CRP development strategic dates be added to the minutes (Annex 1).
- To circulate to ISP members a summary of Future Earth and provide a link on the CCAFS website.

4) **Assessment of 2013 achievements**

- In future annual reports to also highlight more specifically important scientific achievements

5) **Status of performance indicators**

- To request a bibliometric analysis and capture rate before the 2015 evaluation of CCAFS, and to suggest that the Terms of Reference be discussed by the ISP.

6.4 **Progress in the Climate-Smart Village concept and implementation**

- To establish additional villages in Southeast Asia and Latin America considering lessons learnt.

6.6 **IPCC report**

- To conduct a review of CCAFS and CGIAR citations in AR5, to inform future strategy.
- To ask the PMC to consider creating a database of scientists in the CCAFS regions that will extend the pool of scientists who can make a contribution to, e.g., IPCC reports and use the bibliometric analysis to identify scientists.
- ISP wishes to examine activities regarding capacity enhancement in the context of plans for Phase 2.

7) **Engagement and communications**

- To ask the Coordinating Unit to ensure a flexible engagement and communications approach which fits the adjusted Flagship Project structure and priorities of CCAFS in the Extension Phase in 2015 and 2016.

8.1 **Framework for evaluation of CCAFS Theme 3**

- To agree on a prioritized list for two evaluators, and to ask the Coordinating Unit to ensure implementation, including to revert to the RG in writing with new proposals should the selected list not suffice: Lead evaluator and policy aspects: 1. Lindsay Stringer; 2. Debbie Reed; 3. Charlotte Streck. Technical aspects: 1. Himanshu Pathak; 2. Bui Ba Bong; 3. Prihasto Setyanto.
- To request that the inception report and evaluation workplan, including proposed visits, will be prepared by the evaluators during the first two weeks of work.

- To request that the inception report be received electronically by the Reference Group for approval.
- To agree that the final report and draft management response will be tabled for approval by the ISP at its meeting in May 2015, and to send report and response to the CIAT BoT for information at its meeting in May 2015.

8.2 CCAFS theme by region matrix evaluation report and proposed response

- To table report and response for information at the CIAT Board of Trustees at its meeting in May.
- To ask the Coordinating Unit to place report and response on the CCAFS website.

8.3 CCEE plan for CCAFS

- To agree that other future topics for evaluations will be discussed in late 2015 after the external evaluation of CCAFS is completed.
- To note that the EC evaluation called for a review of the role of participatory action research approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation, specifically addressing scientific outputs, after 3-4 years. This will be considered in the late 2015 discussions.

10.1 Extension Proposal

- The revised concept note to be circulated to ISP in August for comment, and again before the final proposal is submitted in late 2014 based on comments from the Consortium Board and Fund Council.
- To support the currently proposed allocation of resources amongst Flagships and Regions, and to request the management team to provide additional written justification in the revised concept note for the Extension Phase.
- To request the management team to present the proposed new portfolio at the ISP meeting in October.
- To recommend a rapid shift of the portfolio from Phase 1 to the Extension Phase so that the new strategy (including impact pathways and M&E) can be fully tested in the Extension Phase.

10.2 Result-based management trial (Flagship Project 4: Policies and Institutions for Climate-Resilient Agriculture)

- To request the draft annual progress report to be put on the agenda for the next meeting.
- To make available to ISP members the summary of the six projects.

11.4 Financial outlook to 2015

- To agree that, in the case of additional funds being made available, the PMC guided by the Program Director, decides how funds should be allocated/used when these adjustments do not exceed 10% of the overall W1&2 budget for that same year. The Program Director will report back to the ISP on decisions made. When funding shifts exceed 10% of the overall budget, it is suggested that the Program Director discusses the PMC plan with the ISP Chair and seeks approval.

14) Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings

- To agree that the following topics should be covered in the October meeting (other topics can be postponed to future meetings):

- Extension Phase and Phase 2 of CRPs
- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy
- Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy
- Implementation of the Data Management Strategy
- Scenarios development, including food systems: global overview of progress and detailed perspective from one region
- Private sector engagement: update

16) ISP self-assessment

- To request that members fill in the self-assessment survey immediately or at the latest by 28 May 2014.
- To ask the Vice-Chair to collect the results from the survey and present the results at the ISP meeting in October 2014.
- To ask the Vice-Chair to propose a revised self-assessment form at the meeting in October 2014.

Follow-up actions from Rome meeting on 10-11 October, 2013

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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
- 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.

- 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.

- 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 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.

- 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.

- 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.
- 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 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 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 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.

- Coordinating Unit to send the minutes from the current meeting to Arona Diedhiou and the new Chair and invite them for the 6th and 7th meetings.

- To ask the Chair to discuss the risks of cutting down to seven ISP members with the CIAT Director General.
- To ask the Chair to contact members that have missed more than one meeting, pointing out the recommendation of the Management Review to have a non-attendance policy, to confirm that they will be able to attend meetings in the future noting that dates are decided one year in advance.
- To ask the Coordinating Unit, together with the Chair, to prepare a set of guidelines for the next meeting which outlines what is expected from ISP members, including a set of recommendations.
- To ask the Program Director to put key actions and follow-ups on decisions from previous meetings on future agendas as a standard item.
- To ask the Program Director to ensure that a system for monitoring indicators of success be developed, and be put on the agenda for ISP meetings in May.
- To request that the Coordinating Unit and CIAT administration enter into a dialogue on strengthening administrative procedures regarding appointment of new ISP members.

Changes in Center budgets from 2014 to 2015¹

As a result of the reorganisation of the research portfolio, Center budgets have changed, sometimes by a very large amount. The Flagships have an updated strategic direction based on the Extension proposal, and this has been the cause of the shift in Center budgets and contributions. In some cases, ongoing work continues, whilst in other areas we see Centers contributing with new lines of research fitting to the new strategic direction.

CCAFS inherited a budget and research portfolio that was largely determined by the amount of funds that Centers wanted to earmark against climate change research from their previous core budgets. This gave a portfolio that was not always logical. In addition, Center activities in Phase 1 were largely conducted in isolation from other Centers (though with some excellent exceptions) and were not well-linked into regionally integrated programs. Furthermore, there were some activities of dubious strategic value (though many of these had been removed by 2013).

In considering activities to be conducted in the Extension Phase, the PMC has largely relied on strategic considerations. However, performance also has to be considered,² as a new portfolio that has many activities from poor performing Centers would not be appropriate. Where poor performing Centers are crucial for thematic and strategic reasons, then measures need to be put in place to lift performance.

To realign the portfolio, CCAFS called for concept notes for all Flagships, with proponents of concept notes being required to link to flagship and regional research priorities, embrace inter-Center collaboration where appropriate, and contribute to defined impact pathways. To select projects in each Flagship CCAFS had a call for contributions to Flagships, with defined strategic priorities. The concept notes submitted under the call were evaluated by management team members and up to three external evaluators, and final decisions on which concept notes would form part of the emerging portfolio were made at PMC level. As management team members are hosted by specific Centers, we consistently removed the scores of management team members for the concept notes from their Center to check for bias. In addition, in all cases there was always at least one external evaluator on the evaluation committee for concept notes (sometimes up to three). Some concept notes that were selected had to be considerably revised (e.g. bringing in new partners, changing budgets, combining with other concept notes). The teams from selected concept notes then went into a planning phase, including a major regional planning workshop, so that teams could be integrated around common impact pathways. Major gaps in the project portfolio were filled by commissioning a few additional projects. The process was very demanding of time, and a learning curve for all. CCAFS management is very appreciative of the time given to the process by Center Contact Points and scientists.

Of the total budget 6% is allocated to Centers (see table below) is allocated to bridging activities, for completing Phase 1 activities that are important to complete (these bridging funds are included in the table), but also provide strategic outcomes for Phase 2. In some cases the funds for these

¹ In this paper, we consider the Window 1 and Window 2 funds going to Centers. We are thus excluding discussion of budgets going to Flagship Leaders, Regional Program Leaders and the Coordinating Unit i.e. budgets are for gap-filling, synthesis, integrative activities, cross-cutting issues (gender and social inequality, data management, monitoring and evaluation, communications, administration and governance.

² CCAFS management has calculated performance scores for Center contributions to CCAFS for three years (2011-2013)

bridging activities have been taken from accepted Extension Phase projects; these latter projects will have a delayed start. In other cases the bridging funds have been secured from other budget lines, in which case Centers with these funds will have a budget decline in 2016, all other things being equal

The resulting 2015 budgets per Center are shown in the attached table, and are compared with the 2014 budgets. Some Centers show major changes. The Centers, their budget changes and the reasons for the budget changes are summarised below:

Four show major increases:

- CIFOR (137%). Increase from a very low Phase 1 budget.
- IRRI (36%). Increase from a very low Phase 1 budget.
- IFPRI (33%). Moderately good performance and expansion of Flagship 4 activities.
- CIAT (26%). Good performance and the expansion into LAM of CCAFS, where CIAT has major activities in all Flagships.

Three Centers show major decreases, and one other Center shows a substantial decrease:

- AfricaRice (-91%), ICARDA (-96%), CIP (-51%). Poor showing in the calls for concept notes (often very limited engagement in the process). These Centers also have been consistently poor performers in CCAFS over the period 2011-2013. ICARDA and AfricaRice now only contribute to CCAFS through bilateral projects and a few months' time of a Contact Point to continue engagement.
- Bioversity retains a relatively large budget, but also had a substantial budget decline (-9%, but much more when bridging funds are removed). This is mostly related to having a very large budget in Phase 1.

The eight biggest Centers in CCAFS (US\$ 2 million or more per annum) are Bioversity, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI, ILRI and IRRI. The largest Centers in each Flagship are as follows, reflecting their strengths in different subject areas:

- Flagship 1: Bioversity, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRAF, IWMI
- Flagship 2: CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI
- Flagship 3: CIAT, CIFOR, CIMMYT, ICRAF, ILRI, IFPRI, IRRI
- Flagship 4: Bioversity, CIAT, ICRISAT, IFPRI (latter being the largest in Flagship 4).

The PMC regards this as an appropriate reflection of the strategic needs of CCAFS, but has noted two potentially problematic issues: (a) an absence of rice research in Africa; and (b) fisheries and aquaculture poorly under-represented in the portfolio.

Table 1. 2015 Center Budgets (Windows 1 and Windows 2) for Flagship Projects, compared to 2014 allocation (000s US\$). Bridging funds are included in the table.¹

CENTER	Flag-ship 1	Flag-ship 2	Flag-ship 3	Flag-ship 4	Flag-ship totals 2015	Contact Points ³	Total 2014	% change in budget
AfricaRice	-	-	-	-	-	35	388	-91%
Bioversity	2,014	383	-	840	3,237	55	3,637	-9%
CIAT	2,140	529	811	792	4,272	65	3,444	26%
CIFOR	-	-	957	-	957	45	422	137%
CIMMYT	1,953	733	760	-	3,446	65	3,273	7%
CIP	105	135	-	560	800	45	1,713	-51%

³ The column “contact points” is (draft) salary and operational support to contact points to deal with generic duties related to CCAFS, and is scaled by budget size – when bilateral budgets are known these will be finalised.

ICARDA	-	-	-	-	-	35	935	-96%
ICRAF	1,775	1,105	915	280	4,075	65	3,251	27%
ICRISAT	493	909	60	750	2,212	55	2,196	3%
IFPRI	170	449	502	1,450	2,571	55	1,975	33%
IITA	450	-	-	571	1,021	45	1,276	-16%
ILRI	665	397	684	447	2,193	55	2,445	-8%
IRRI	770	200	449	370	1,789	55	1,352	36%
IWMI	1,100	280	-	-	1,380	45	1,281	11%
WorldFish	210	-	102	220	532	45	603	-4%
TOTAL ALLOCATI ON	11,843	5,120	5,240	6,280	28,483	765	28,191	

i Bridging funds that are additional to the accepted extension phase projects were allocated as follows: Bioversity US\$448,CIP US\$250, ICRAF US\$405,ICRISAT US\$170, CIMMYT US\$335 and ILRI US\$190.

IRRI'S Budget for 2015 will not reach US\$ 2 million as they have elected to postpone the start of one of their projects, but it should climb above US\$2 million in 2016 after the recruitment of new staff.