

CCAFS
8th INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING
8 – 9 May, 2015
Nairobi, Kenya
Minutes

Participants:

Brian Keating (Chair)
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)
Mercedes Bustamente
Arona Diedhiou
Fatima Denton
Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza
Charles Rice (*ex officio*, CIAT BoT)
Carolina Vera (*ex officio*, Future Earth)

Regrets:

Ram Badan Singh
Christof Walter (Vice-Chair)

Invited participants:

Program Management Committee
Andy Jarvis, Flagship 1 (for agenda items 1-10)
Lini Wollenberg, Flagship 3 (for agenda items 1-10)
Robert Zougmore, West Africa (for agenda items 1-10)
James Kingyangi, East Africa (for agenda items 1-10)
Sonja Vermeulen, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-10)

Others

Jim Hansen, Flagship 2 (for agenda items 1-4)
Arame Tall, Flagship 2 (for agenda item 4.4)
Anette Englund Friis, Coordinating Unit (Secretary) (for agenda items 1-14)
Sophia Huyer, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-10)
Angela Samundengo, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-10)

Regrets:

Pramod Aggerwal, South Asia

1) Welcome by the Chair and announcements

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed the participants and new members of the ISP Mercedes Bustamente and Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza. Jimmy Smith, DG of ILRI welcomed ISP members to the ILRI campus. Anette Friis provided practical information about lunch, dinner, etc.

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

2.1 Adoption of agenda

An additional agenda item on reflections from the field trip to the Climate-Smart Villages in Kisumu and on reflection of decisions was added.

2.2 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

Minutes

The minutes were approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 7th ISP meeting. The approved minutes without confidential elements 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 background paper (CCAFS ISP8/2.2.2).

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 in substantive agenda items are dealt with below, while others are listed under future agenda items (Agenda Item 11). We have postponed a number of the decisions from meeting #7 to meeting #9, namely the future partnerships between Future Earth and CCAFS, capacity strengthening issues, priority setting (awaiting the call for Phase 2), bibliometric studies (as we have only completed the compilation of publications from 2014 in late April) and issues around the Gender IDO (as the Gender and Social Inclusion research leader has only recently started her contract).

Meeting #7, Item 2.2, CCAFS visits to Centers

To date, CCAFS has facilitated visits with the following Centers: IFPRI, CIP, IRRI, WorldFish, CIFOR and Bioversity. These were useful, covering CCAFS expectations of program participants, human resources planning, problem areas and possibilities for deepening engagement. They have been well received and useful.

Meeting #7, Item 4, Extension Proposal

PMC was to circulate the next set of comments on the Extension Proposal to the ISP, but no further comments were received. The proposal was accepted in the form previously circulated.

Meeting #7, Item 9, CCAFS Risk Catalogue

The PMC updated the risk catalogue in relation to the requests from the ISP: clarity in the way risk owners are defined, adjust the mitigation column, revise risk owners statement. The PMC proposes to do substantive revisions of the risk catalogue once per year, to present as an agenda item at the November ISP meeting. Ethics approval procedures are in place in at least 8 Centers; other Centers failed to respond to the request as to whether ethics approval procedures were in place

Decisions:

- To note that the minutes from the 7th have been approved by the ISP via email consultation
- To note the progress on matters arising from the previous minutes.

2.3 Updates from *ex officio* members

Program Director

Since the last meeting of the ISP, one of the activities of the CCAFS core team has been dealing with successive budget additions and cuts (new DFID money; three downward changes in the financial plan for 2015). CCAFS held or participated in numerous meetings at COP20. Of particular note was the Hackathon event that CCAFS hosted, the workshop for farmers organisations to build capacity on the negotiating process, the CARE-CCAFS seminar that brought in many civil society players, and the CCAFS-Kenya government official side event. The major CSA meeting in Montpellier provided space for the core team to meet amongst themselves and with Centers and partners. CCAFS helped sponsor the conference by funding CCAFS developing country partners to attend. Other major activities in this interim period have been: the first meeting with the external evaluation team; a gender and climate change seminar in Paris; and a meeting on metrics for CSA with ca. 10 major agencies. Key forthcoming meetings are as follows:

- a) UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies meetings (SBSTA), Bonn. 1-11 June
- b) Our Common Future under Climate Change science conference, Paris. 7-11 July.
- c) 2nd International Global Food Security conference, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA. 11-14 October.
- d) UNFCCC COP21, Paris. 30 November - 11 December.

CCAFS has also been active in the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA). The Director has been part of two Consortium/ISPC working groups to define the new portfolio of the CGIAR.

CCAFS has had two significant staff additions in the last few months: Anette Friis as the Head of Program Coordination, and Sophia Huyer as Gender and Social Inclusion Research Leader.

The CCAFS annual report was completed on 30th April. As the timing is bad for the ISP meeting, a brief verbal update will be given on the annual report.

Future Earth

Future Earth continues progressing forward. It now has a new secretariat with a structure that spans five global hubs functioning as a single entity: Montreal; Paris; Japan; Tokyo; Stockholm and Colorado. The Secretariat of Future Earth will be staffed by the end of 2015. Currently, they are operating with 1.5 full time person at Stockholm and Paris each, along with the Executive Director and many part-time volunteers who are helping in the interim period. The 5 Global Hub Directors will be hired by September 2015, and rest of the staff within 6 months of that.

The Future Earth Engagement Committee was fully appointed in by the end of 2014 and jointly met with the Science Committee in Argentina, last December. During that month also, the Strategic Research Agenda 2014 was published. You may remember that I sent it to all of you by e-mail, once it was released. The agenda identifies critical priorities for global change and sustainability research over the next 3–5 years. These priorities are intended to provide guidance for solutions-oriented research to meet the global societal challenges identified in the Future Earth 2025 Vision. Many of them are highly related with CCAFS. The committees are currently working in developing a proposal for taking the 2015 prioritized initiatives forwards. The next Future Earth Science Committee/Engagement Committee /Governing Council Meetings are planned for June 1-5 in Vienna.

The Fast-Track Initiatives and Cluster activities awarded in 2014 for a period of 2 years, are currently being implemented. These initiatives build on areas of research strength in the existing Global Environmental Change (GEC) projects and programmes, and are intended to kick-start integrated activities. A proposal submitted by Arame Tall, of IFPRI, entitled Towards an Integrated Africa Climate Research for Development, was not awarded in the first round, but a reformulation was requested.

Future Earth continues having regular project webinars, and CCAFS has participated in a number of them. The transitions of the core projects from the previous GEC programs to Future Earth continue.

You may remember that CCAFS-Future Earth hosted a workshop in Copenhagen in late October “Towards a global research program on food systems”, where the objective was 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. the Science and engagement Committee in their meeting of last December added further support to having some kind of focus on food systems within Future Earth.

Future Earth, the International Social Science Council and CCAFS hosted a meeting in Paris on “Closing the gender gap in farming under climate change”. This was highly successful and included a panel with individuals such as Sir Gordon Conway, ex-Premier Mary Robinson and

ICSU President Heide Hackmann. Future Earth is also participating heavily in the Paris Conference, Our Common Future Under Climate Change.

CIAT Board of Trustees

Thomas Rosswall and Charles Rice presented on CCAFS at the last CIAT BoT meeting, with the Director participating via a telephone link. The BoT appointed Dr. Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza as a member of the ISP for 2015-2017. It also approved the CCAFS workplan and budget for 2015. Guidelines for ISP governance were approved by the BoT. The discussion on CCAFS was brief and addressed the issue of non-performing Centers. This can be seen as a strength, since it shows that CCAFS increasingly only has strategic components in its portfolio. However, attention should be given to Centers with expertise, central to the strategy of CCAFS. The lead of CCAFS in providing public goods is appreciated and the website is an important data portal. The status of the CCAFS external reviews were presented with the expressed concern of the number of simultaneous reviews as a burden on staff time. While necessary the number of reviews diverts attention from the science activities. Great appreciation was expressed for Dr. Thomas Rosswall on his excellent leadership of the ISP for CCAFS from the formative stages to present. There were many positive references to CCAFS also under other agenda items. The next BoT meeting will be in Cali on 19-21 May; the following meeting will be in the week of 9 November, also in Cali.

Decisions:

- To note the updates

3) Update on CCAFS: history and future steps

Given the new ISP members and being at a turning point in moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2, it is timely to reflect on CCAFS history and future steps.

CCAFS started as a Challenge Program in 2009 with the appointment of a Director, though the theme leaders only took up their posts in early 2010 and Regional Program Leaders (for three regions: West Africa, East Africa, South Asia) only started mid to late 2010. While some implementation was achieved in 2010 (including the initiation of baseline surveys), perhaps more important was the fact that some key management and governance arrangements were established and the CRP proposal was prepared, allowing CCAFS to start on a footing very different from other CRPs.

From 2011-2014 CCAFS completed Phase 1. In 2011, two further regions were added (South East Asia, Latin America) to make it a more global program. Region selection was based on a relatively detailed priority setting exercise, including stakeholder input. In the Challenge Program there were six themes – these were reduced to four in the CRP (Adaptation to Progressive Climate Change; Management of Climate Risk; Pro-Poor Climate Change Mitigation; Integration for Decision Making, the latter including linking knowledge to action, data and tools, and policy

analysis frameworks). From 2012 to 2014 various internal evaluations were conducted, covering governance and management, M&E, matrix management and Theme 3. The governance system in CCAFS, particularly the ISP arrangements, has been positively reviewed. Throughout this phase, results-based management was applied with a strong focus on achieving outcomes. Publications produced, outcomes achieved, as well as case studies related to partnership, capacity strengthening, and gender and social inequality are detailed in each of the CCAFS annual reports.

In 2014, CCAFS took advantage of the Extension Phase (2015-2016) to reorganize its portfolio and to build a coherent set of inter-linked impact pathways in Regions and Flagships, complemented by a web-based Planning and Reporting System. The regions from Phase 1 were retained but the Themes were slightly modified into four Flagships (Climate-Smart Practices and Portfolios; Climate Information Services and Climate-Informed Safety-Nets; Low Emissions Development; Policies and Institutions for Climate-Resilient Food Systems). The previous sub-themes linking knowledge to action, and data and tools were mainstreamed in all Flagships, while a new post was created for a Gender and Social Inclusion Research Leader, so as to raise the profile and activities on this topic in all Flagships. This new portfolio was achieved through an iterative process that included: developing global impact pathways; developing regional impact pathways; calls for concept notes that demonstrated clear linkages to the impact pathways and outcomes; regional planning meetings to further develop projects out of selected concept notes; development of targets and indicators for the impact pathways.

At the level of the entire CGIAR, a new Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) has been produced. This gives much attention to climate change, the intention being that climate change, policies and institutions, gender and youth, and capacity development are mainstreamed into all CRPs. This has led to some believing that CCAFS will not be a CRP in Phase 2. The Phase 2 CRP portfolio is now being discussed, the intention being to reduce the number of CRPs. Various initial proposals have been made including one that splits climate change adaptation and mitigation, with CCAFS remaining as an adaptation Flagship and mitigation going to a Landscapes and natural resource management CRP.

From late May to late August a concept note for Phase 2 needs to be prepared. These concept notes will be evaluated by the ISPC for a decision by the Fund Council in late 2015 or early 2016. Successful concept notes will then go to the full proposal stage for a final decision by the Fund Council in late 2016. Phase 2 begins January 2017.

Decisions:

- To note the evolution of CCAFS into its current form
- To note that splitting CCAFS into an adaptation and mitigation CRP makes no sense, when the rest of the agricultural community (e.g. farmers' organisations, investors, private sector) is pushing to bring adaptation and mitigation together.

4) CCAFS Science Issues

4.1 Private Sector Engagement: Update

The fifth ISP meeting (10-11 October 2013, Rome) made the decision *“To systematically use businesses and their NGO partners as agents for enabling good practice and research results to benefit farmers vulnerable to climate change”*. More specifically, *“The most strategic activity for 2014 will be to build communications channels with private sector entities that work with farmers vulnerable to climate change, and with their NGO partners, to increase uptake and application of CCAFS research results, tools and datasets to the benefit of farmers and wider food security.”*

Program-wide progress: In 2014, CCAFS instituted a new program-wide re-alignment of the portfolio using a competitive process. Under this new results-based management system, proposals were evaluated in terms of the plausibility of their impact pathways to achieve CCAFS outcome targets. While inclusion of private sector partners was not an evaluation criterion for proposals, such partnerships were recognized as being among the key plausible strategies to bring about subsets of outcomes under Flagships 1, 2 and 3 (e.g. extension services, insurance products, managing the role of agriculture in deforestation). Overall, 8% of activities in the 2015 portfolio involve private sector engagement, double the average level of engagement in 2012, 2013 and 2014. Of course quality of engagement matters as much as quantity, and CGIAR has been the subject of critique from NGOs in regard to past private sector engagement. An analysis of challenges and success factors in past private sector engagement by CGIAR and CCAFS has been conducted. Project leaders are asked to include relevant private sector partners right from the start of their projects (e.g. for larger partnerships at the initial regional planning meetings) and to maintain usual program procedures for open access data management and development of global public goods.

Progress with the specific global outreach activity for 2014: During the year, CCAFS Coordinating Unit worked with CCAFS Themes, Regions and Centres to deliver five events focused on private sector outreach. Three events were topic-oriented: *‘Agriculture growth, jobs, food security and climate: Taking action in response to IPCC’* (April 2014, London), *‘Alternate Wetting and Drying in Rice’* (September 2014, webinar) and *‘Insuring the future of farmers under climate change’* (January 2015, London). These events were in each case organized in collaboration with leading private sector representatives: Willis Re, Association for Carbon Professionals and Swiss Re (in the last case, together with Agricultural Insurance Corporation of Nigeria and Agriculture Insurance Company of India). Additionally, regional webinars were offered to the five CCAFS regions and taken up on the basis of private sector demand in two of the regions: East Africa (August 2014, webinar) and Latin America (September 2014, webinar). The two regional webinars focused on East Africa and Latin America was organized with inputs from relevant industry bodies: the Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA), Rice Growers Federation in Colombia (Fedearroz), Cereals and Legumes Growers Federation in Colombia (Fenalce), and Coffee Cooperatives of Northern Nicaragua (Cecocafen). These webinars introduced CCAFS tools and resources to the attendees. Overall these five events reached over 500 participants directly and many more indirectly (e.g. the knowledge product prepared for the April 2014 workshop was downloaded more than 18,000 times).

Strategy for global engagement with private sector in 2015: In 2014 CCAFS initiated engagement with the two industry-wide bodies that have explicit programs on climate change and agriculture: the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the World Economic Forum (WEF). WBCSD and CCAFS propose that CCAFS will be the science partner on WBCSD's Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) stream within the Low Carbon Technology and Partnerships Initiative (LCTPi). The focus will be on livelihoods and adaptation, in addition to mitigation. In addition to technologies, the work will focus on practices and behaviors. WBCSD members will announce ambitious targets for CSA at the time of the Paris COP. Under WEF, CCAFS/CGIAR co-hosted, with other GACSA partners, a dinner for Ministers and senior executives at the Davos Forum in January 2015, to highlight opportunities for CSA and reduced deforestation. Going forward, CCAFS will explore specific opportunities for collaboration with the two CSA programs under WEF, Grow Africa and Grow Asia. CCAFS will also collaborate with the Investment Action Group of GACSA on demand-driven knowledge needs (e.g. CSA metrics).

Decisions:

- To note the expansion of private sector engagement across the CCAFS portfolio under the new results-based management framework of the extension phase.
- To endorse the collaboration with WBCSD to develop a science-based roadmap for ambitious implementation of CSA to 2030 (i.e. beyond members' previous targets for mitigation and local economic benefits) and to communicate these in the build-up to the Paris COPs
- To ask the PMC to formulate a set of strategic research questions to guide private sector research under Flagship 4 and global engagement with the business community.

4.2 CCAFS role in IPCC AR5

The IPCC AR5 report, released in 2013 and 2014, contained multiple inputs from CCAFS scientists. Andy Challinor and Phil Thornton were lead authors for Chapter 7 on "Food production and food security", Pramod Aggerwal was Review Editor and a number of CGIAR scientists were also chapter reviewers, and many more scientists from across the centers inputted through articles that were cited in the AR5. A number of figures developed by Andy Challinor for Chapter 7 were also used in the summary for policy makers released subsequently in 2014. CIFOR updated emissions factors for the wetlands supplement published in 2014. A total of 143 journal articles and 65 book chapters/reports from CGIAR were cited in AR5.

CCAFS also complemented the IPCC report launch by holding events with key stakeholders in London on food security impacts and adaptation needs and in Washington on mitigation potential in agriculture. These were attended by ca. 150 people; videos and presentations were viewed online by more than 5,000 people. The synthesis document produced has been downloaded 18,500 times to date.

Significant success in positioning CCAFS as a key source of scientific knowledge for the IPCC report was achieved. The IPCC report itself contributes to CCAFS goals by influencing policy,

investment and strategic directions of key development agencies. Output users, such as EU, Oxfam, IFAD, representatives from the UN, WB, DFID and US Senate Budget Committee, used the chapter to call for increased international cooperation. The Summary for Policymakers was used by others, such as the UNFCCC, to influence adaptation frameworks and toolkits focusing on iterative risk management.

In subsequent initiatives CCAFS, with other agencies, made a request to IPCC to consider doing a special report on agriculture bringing together adaptation and mitigation. This is being considered in future IPCC workshop which CCAFS will attend.

Decisions:

- To recommend that CCAFS PMC continues to pro-actively engage with the IPCC process, seeking AR6 authorship and responding to emerging knowledge gaps with targeted papers that are used by IPCC
- To encourage CCAFS management to consider ways to increase the involvement of developing country partners and scientists in CCAFS, facilitating greater participation in the IPCC process (and other global assessments) through review papers, and regional and global syntheses in high impact journals
- To encourage CCAFS management to disseminate and promote the results of the citation analysis which demonstrates positive global impact of the program

4.3 Global Alliance on Climate-Smart Agriculture

The Global Alliance on Climate-Smart Agriculture was launched at the UN Climate Summit in September 2014, with CCAFS leading the organization of a dedicated event in New York at which founder members declared their support and ambitions under the Alliance. The first working meeting was held in December 2014 at FAO in Rome. CCAFS/CGIAR joined and attended, by advance agreement representing the CGIAR centers that are members in their own right (CIAT, CIFOR, ICRAF, IFPRI, Bioversity). Participants nominated and endorsed Inge Rydland (Norwegian Government) and Martin Bwalya (NEPAD Agency) as the Co-Chairs of the Strategic Committee of GACSA for the Inception Year (commencing 1 January 2015). Three Action Groups, on Knowledge, Investment and Enabling Environment, will support the work of GACSA members in their efforts to contribute to the agreed vision and goals. CCAFS/CGIAR nominated itself as a co-convenor of the Knowledge Action Group and was selected alongside FAO. In addition, CCAFS/CGIAR sits on the Steering Committee of GACSA, represented by the Consortium Office. CCAFS and FAO organized the first working meeting of the Knowledge Action Group in March 2015, at which members developed components of a workplan for 2015.

In the inception year, the Knowledge Action Group will produce outputs in five priority areas: (a) Technical interventions and practices in CSA; (b) Evidence base of CSA; (c) Support, services and extension for CSA; (d) Inclusive knowledge systems for CSA; (e) Integrated

planning and monitoring for CSA. CCAFS will produce/co-produce outputs including practice briefs on nutrient management, livestock, agroforestry, climate information services, and formal and informal institutions. CCAFS will also develop CSA case studies, a compendium of farm-level practices, and conduct participatory policy scenarios in 4 GACSA member countries, together with the Enabling Environment Action Group.

Decisions:

- To recommend that CCAFS support the CGIAR Consortium in the Steering Committee of GACSA to guide the development of the Alliance and maximize its success in its Inception Year.
- To encourage CCAFS Coordinating Unit to provide strong leadership of the Knowledge Action Group of GACSA during the Inception Year, working closely with co-facilitator FAO and other members to deliver tangible outputs by December 2015, as laid out in the Knowledge Action Group workplan.
- To urge the CCAFS team to give strategic background support to NEPAD in preparation and delivery of the 2017 Global Science Conference on Climate Smart Agriculture.
- To request CCAFS management to review CCAFS' role in GACSA at the end of the Inception Year.

4.4 Climate Information Services: downscaling, reaching users, integrating with other agricultural advisories

The 6th ISP meeting (Managua, May 2014) reviewed the status and near-term outlook for Theme 2 research and engagement agenda for climate information and advisory services. With rapid progress in this area, an expansion of climate services work in the new Flagship 2 portfolio, and several new members on the ISP, an update was requested.

Six of the 9 core Flagship 2 projects include aspects of climate services. The CASCAID project in WA and the AGROCLIMAS in LAM will strengthen capacity of NMHS to produce agriculturally relevant climate information, capacity of intermediaries to communicate climate information and advisories, and capacity of farmers and institutional decision-makers to use climate-related information. Other Flagship 2 projects with a climate services focus are: a CARE-led project on climate-based advisories for women and ethnic minorities in SE Asia, an IRRI-led project that will incorporate climate information into a crop management ICT platform in SEA and SA, a CIMMYT-led project that will improve food security early warning regionally in EA, and an ILRI-led project that will develop early warning systems for climate-sensitive crops and livestock diseases in SEA.

At its 6th meeting, the ISP reaffirmed the need to continue to give sufficient priority to emerging opportunities, external partnerships, and mobilization of external funds to bring climate information services into agricultural development and policy. Efforts to develop external partnerships and mobilize external funds has continued to progress on several fronts. The USAID Africa Bureau has given CCAFS US\$ 1M to strengthen capacity for climate services in Africa in collaboration with regional organizations and programs, with an additional US\$ 300k anticipated. Final approval is anticipated shortly for a US\$ 4-6M USAID

Rwanda Mission grant to develop climate services for farmers and for government agricultural planning.

Consistent with its 2019 Outcome target of strengthening how at least US\$ 15M of climate service funding is invested, Flagship 2 is engaged with major funders including: World Bank, IFAD and DfID.

Several CCAFS activities that were reported at the 6th ISP meeting have made further progress in mainstreaming climate services into national processes. In Senegal, seasonal climate forecast information has been communicated to an estimated 2M farmers, and mainstreamed into the country's 2014 Agricultural Plan (WA RPL, ICRISAT, ANACIM (national meteorological service), Ministry of Agriculture). In Colombia, the LAM RPL and CIAT partnered with the Ministry of Agriculture and producer associations to bring agro-climatic information into agricultural decision-making. The GFCS Adaptation Program in Africa (Tanzania and Malawi) successfully completed its first year of implementation, with CCAFS co-leading the agriculture component. CCAFS, working closely with WFP, is on track for its project commitments. However, project accomplishments may fall short of expectations due to partnership challenges, and delays in hiring CCAFS project personnel to provide sufficient presence in the target countries.

Theme 2 commissioned an evaluation of its work on climate services for farmers, through the first phase of CCAFS. The Evaluator's main recommendations (in summary form) were:

1. More proactive dissemination of CCAFS materials on climate services;
2. Improve the use of the IRI's Climate Predictability Tool (CPT);
3. Embed climate services in agricultural extension, into national agencies (meteorological and agriculture) that can provide sustainability;
4. Foster integration of climate services with other types of information and services, considering Climate-Smart Villages as a promising approach to bundling;
5. Strengthen cost-benefit estimates of climate information services; and
6. Address the scaling-up challenge: How to provide services at scale that are sufficiently tailored to the diversity of context-specific needs, particularly for those most vulnerable?

Document CCAFS ISP8-4.4.2 provides an overview of the evaluation process, and the Flagship 2 Leader's response to each recommendation. Recommendations 1, 3 and 4 had already been largely incorporated into the evolving strategy at the time of the evaluation. Recommendation 2, based on just one respondent, is more appropriate for the IRI (which developed, maintains, supports the use of CPT) than for CCAFS. The last two recommendations identify important gaps that warrant greater attention. The recommendation to provide cost-benefit estimates of climate information services identifies a gap in expertise that will be addressed in part, by plans to hire a researcher to work on the ex-ante estimation of the value of climate services investments, to be hosted at the African Climate Policy Center. The final recommendation on scaling up climate services highlights one of the most important strategic challenges at this stage of development. The FL has targeted this as a new priority for research and communication, and will present this challenge to Flagship 2 Project Leaders and key partners for their contribution.

Decisions:

- To note progress since ISP-6 in developing external partnerships, and in mobilization of external funds to bring climate information services into agricultural development and policy.
- To ask CCAFS management to strengthen evidence of the value of climate services for agriculture and food security including formal scientific analysis and stakeholder farmer feedback/views.
- To urge CCAFS participants to undertake research to address the challenge of scaling up context-relevant climate services for rural communities and other stakeholders, and develop strategies to engage relevant governments with a view to sustaining improved climate services, in response to a commissioned review of Theme 2 climate services work.

4.5 CCAFS and its livestock portfolio

- Overview of livestock sector and challenges posed by climate change (Jimmy Smith)
- Brief presentation of current livestock portfolio in CCAFS, including strategic work with L&F (Polly Ericksen)
- Gaps from both CCAFS and L&F perspective. Some initially proposed gaps include funds for comprehensive emissions measurements across a representative range of livestock systems; research on financial mechanisms to fund Low Emissions Development in the livestock sector; research on the enabling institutional environment needed to incentivise behaviour change. .
- Current and future ideas to build interactions and fill the gaps. Initial ideas include developing and disseminating the narratives around: win-wins for productivity improvement and GHG emissions reductions; clarifying how smallholders will benefit from such win-wins. Engagement with African governments is crucial to get buy in.

This session has been organised to make the most of the ISP meeting location in Nairobi, where ILRI is based. In Phase 1, ILRI has been classified as one of the six “large” Centers in CCAFS given the budget size for Center activities. In addition, ILRI and CIAT are the only two Centers that host both a Theme Leader and a Regional Program Leader. In the first year of the Extension Phase (2015) the relative W1 and 2 and EU W3 budget for ILRI Center activities (now “Projects”) has fluctuated between \$5.7-\$5.8 million before any budget cuts announced by Consortium in the late 2014 and increased from that of Phase 1 (of total budget in 2014 and in 2015).

Decisions:

- To note the large portfolio of livestock-related activities in CCAFS
- To note the following gaps in the portfolio identified by ILRI:
 - Data gaps and model weaknesses of greenhouse gas emissions for livestock/grazing systems in developing countries
 - Genetics for different systems and environments in relation to climate change adaptation

- Feedback and interaction between livestock and feed/pastures
- Low emissions food security strategies with improved nutritional quality
- Financial analysis for low emissions development involving livestock

5) Update on management, outcome and impact external reviews

Since the start of CCAFS, the CCAFS core team has paid attention to “internal learning” to improve value for money. One element of this relates to learning from reviews and studies on CCAFS operations, outcomes and outputs. There are four kinds of reviews that inform internal learning (see CCAFS ISP8/5.1):

- a) Reviews conducted by donors, the consortium and the Internal Evaluation Arrangement.
- b) CRP-Commissioned External Reviews (CCERs). These are commissioned through the ISP or CIAT Board
- c) Core team commissioned reviews (by PMC, theme leaders, regional program leaders and coordinating unit)
- d) Center-commissioned reviews, including impact studies as required by the contract between CIAT and participating Centres.

All forms of review are discussed at core team meetings, and they lead to new actions where appropriate.

There is a particular issue with ex-post impact studies. The CGIAR (in particular SPIA – System-wide Program for Impact Assessment) expects a regular set of such studies from Centers and/or CRPs. In the contracts issued by CCAFS through CIAT, it was a requirement for each Center to do such impact assessments, on a timeline determined by budget size (e.g. Centres with a “large budget” had to do one impact assessment every three years). Our experience with this system is that it has not worked – the number of such studies required across the entire CRP is too many and Centers that did not have good cases were wasting resources doing poor impact studies. Going forward, we suggest that the PMC sets aside a budget for impact studies and commissions one or two per year based on good cases.

Decisions:

- To note the many reviews already conducted and to recommend that no CCER be undertaken in 2016, given the large external review in 2015.
- To approve the proposal that in future the PMC sets aside a budget for impact assessments and undertakes a competitive call to develop a strong case for an impact study.

6) Theme 3 Evaluation

An external evaluation was conducted for Theme 3 in 2014 by an independent consultant, Gordon Smith, who conducted a desk review of outputs, interviewed 31 individuals

(program staff and stakeholders), and visited activity leaders and projects in East Africa. A second evaluator, Himanchu Pathak, was not given permission by the Government of India to participate late in the process of the review, so plans to visit two regions and review materials more comprehensively, could not be realized. Key findings were that Theme 3:

- Is generally relevant to the program goals and objectives. However, some gaps exist.
- Is generally effectively managed.
- Is efficient, and management and transactions costs of the program are low.
- Has had moderate impact; some activities are high impact and some appear to have little impact.
- Has many sustainable outcomes.
- Has a very high quality of science for selected outputs. A fair number of science outputs are solid science, but not high impact.

Recommendations and management responses are summarized below:

1. CCAFS Theme 3 should clearly articulate a vision for a pathway or pathways where hundreds of millions of food insecure smallholder farmers can escape from poverty. This escape will likely involve transitions, over a few decades, to non-farming livelihoods, high value agricultural products, and larger scale farming.

Response: A vision statement will be posted on our website, such as:
Flagship 3 seeks to improve low emissions agricultural development options, which involves finance of transformative new practices that support sustainable intensification and increasing efficiency of production, both of which lead to higher economic productivity and access to markets for more sustainable products.

2. CCAFS Theme 3 should continue with efforts to develop emission factors and inexpensive methods for assessing nitrous oxide emissions from a variety of smallholder farming vegetation types, management practices, and soil conditions, including emission rates several years after practice changes.

Response: A major four-year global project was initiated by CIMMYT in 2015 to support improved N₂O emissions quantification. In addition, N₂O measurement will occur for pasture and manure management in Colombia and Kenya and rice in Vietnam during this period.

3. CCAFS Theme 3 should increase the measurement of the effectiveness of interventions with smallholder farmers and policy makers, and ensure that measurement of effectiveness is incorporated in all capacity building and policy change activities undertaken by CCAFS, and this work should be done comparatively in multiple countries. Measuring the effectiveness of different interventions is different from impact evaluation. It is to assess what interventions work better. “Climate Smart Villages” are a promising venue for conducting much of this work on effectiveness of interventions.

Response: Results-based management using outcome indicators and implemented in 2014 will improve measurement of effectiveness.

4. CCAFS Theme 3 should dramatically increase the quality of financial analysis of returns to

different smallholder farming practices and systems, including comparisons of alternative systems.

Response: Improved financial analysis will be conducted for three to four projects in 2015 and repeated in 2016 if useful for other projects.

5. CCAFS Theme 3 should continue work to develop methods to make inexpensive and accurate estimates of GHG emissions from landscapes that include smallholder farms.

Response: During 2015 to 2018, GHG quantification and low cost methods have been integrated into sector—focused projects, including livestock in East Africa, Costa Rica and Colombia; rice in Bangladesh, Vietnam and Colombia, and fertilizer-related nitrous oxide emissions in Mexico and India. In addition, tools are being developed by the University of Aberdeen to enable policy makers to estimate emissions from different mitigation options.

6. CCAFS Theme 3 should develop efficient sample selection systems and plot designs for measuring biomass carbon stock change in smallholder farming and agroforestry systems.

Response: Improved biomass sampling is partly addressed by SAMPLES guidelines for GHG measurement in smallholder systems. A procedure for efficient estimation of soil carbon stocks at the farm and landscape scale will be added to the guidelines in 2015.

7. CCAFS Theme 3 should consistently implement its requirement that publications supported by CCAFS be open access. CCAFS should investigate procedures for working with partners to get open access to partner publications that are partially the result of CCAFS-funded work.

Response: We will continue to remind authors and partners of the open-access policy. In the future, we would like to include this in contracts. Inevitably, some very high impact journals (Nature, Science) are not open access though and trade-offs will occur.

8. CCAFS Theme 3 should request that CGIAR provide all its units, including CCAFS Theme 3, a work and budget planning and reporting system where work plan commitments can be directly compared to delivered work, activities may have durations longer than one year, deliverables may be due in year later than initial funding, and expansions of prior activities are clearly linked to those prior activities. The new tracking system was not reviewed and may have these capacities.

Response: A beta version of a new CCAFS system is being tested in 2015 and all of these features have been incorporated into its structure.

Decisions:

- To note the review and endorse the PMC response, but to express disappointment in the review itself, noting particularly a lack of attention to strategic issues and some recommendations which are beyond the scope of Theme 3. The ISP believes the 2015 external evaluation will address these deficiencies. The evaluation and response will be

submitted to the CIAT BoT at its meeting also in May 2015. If approved, the report and response will be placed on the CCAFS website.

7) Internal Auditors report

The first phase of the internal audit is complete, the second phase being site visits to participating Centers. The audit made positive references to CCAFS systems, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Overall comments to CCAFS, highlighting the positive references

Background and Summary	<p>“As one of the most collaborative CRPs involving the participation of all 15 CGIAR Centers in addition to 4 universities as major partners, CCAFS also maintains a strong and independent governance and management structure that has been in place since its inception. This independence has helped the CRP to better ensure that it performs only strategic research that is clearly aligned with impact pathways that will directly lead to the achievement of its established Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs). Movement during 2014 to a project-specific proposal and fund allocation system as opposed to the legacy pro rata CGIAR Center allocation has only further strengthened this effectiveness.”</p> <p>“Although the CIAT Board of Trustees exercises oversight and possesses the final decision making authority on the allocation of funds, it has thus far upheld all recommendations and decisions made by expert and independent members of the ISP.”</p> <p>“Whilst CCAFS has been well managed and executed overall, there is nevertheless potential for improvement that can be gained....”</p>
Governance & Management	<p>“The Independent Science Panel (ISP) is functioning effectively...”</p> <p>“All ISP minutes are published on the CCAFS website to the public. This helps to further ensure transparency and fairness...”</p> <p>“There is an adequately functioning risk management process in place for CCAFS”</p>
Financial Management	<p>“The budget of CCAFS is not dominated by any individual CG center. This means that there is less room for potential conflicts of interest between what might be best for an individual center vs what might be best for the CRP overall.”</p>
Project Management	<p>“Unlike other CRPs, the Program Director (PD), with his team of Theme Leaders and Regional Leaders, has power and authority to review and approve budgets for participating centers. This includes challenging whether or not bilateral projects are strategic in nature</p>

	<p>to the CRP and if so, whether they should be mapped.”</p> <p>“The system has been further enhanced during 2014 in planning for 2015 and onward,..... This System helps to ensure that research dollars are being used in the most strategic way possible.”</p>
--	---

A number of key issues were identified where improvement in systems is needed, namely:

1. Cascading Overhead for Subcontracted CG Center Work – where one Center contracts another Centre and they both take full overheads.

This has nearly been solved, with almost all inter-Center contracting now done by the lead Center, thus minimizing double overheads. Further, the PMC proposes issuing a rule not allowing direct sub-contracting.

2. Overcharging of Overhead to CCAFS W1&2 Funds – numerous CG Participating Centers have consistently charged a higher overhead rate than should have been charged to CCAFS W1&2 Funds (with an estimated total overcharge amount greater than \$1.5M).

CIAT has been in contact with the Consortium on this since early 2014, but so far no guidelines on overhead rates have been drawn up. The PMC proposes informing Centers that their overhead rate in 2015 has to match their Center-audited rate (and see what repercussions this brings).

3. Lack of Detailed Budget vs. Actual Expenditure Analyses – previous analyses have been conducted at Theme by Center level, and the auditors recommend this be down to activity level.

The auditors talk about “activity” level – there are 400+ activities in CCAFS. If we implemented this we would have to hire new staff and eat into valuable management time. We believe these detailed analyses should be conducted in Centers and not in CCAFS. We do however propose to do detailed analyses down to “Project” level (90+ projects). This is already an order of magnitude more than we have previously done.

4. Disclosure of Mapped Bilateral Project Details – the auditors request more detail on what is disclosed by bilateral projects mapped to CCAFS.

We will revise the P&R system to better capture more details in bilateral projects.

5. Misaligned Performance Management Systems – the auditors believe that the theme and region leaders need to be formally linked to the annual performance reviews of scientists in Centers, and recommend a formal feedback from the ISP chair to the DG CIAT on the performance of the Director.

We propose a formal feedback of the ISP Chair to the DG CIAT. Centers all have different HR systems and it is impossible to interface with them formally. We don't believe Project Leaders should undergo performance review – instead all Projects will be annually reviewed through the Results-Based Management System and the results of this review will go to Center Contact Points. It is in the Centres interest to ensure effective and efficient Projects, so well-functioning Centres will use the project review in the performance assessment of Project Leaders.

Decisions:

- To complement the PMC on the positive internal audit
- To approve the management response to the audit

8) Reflections on the field trip

ISP members reflected on the previous day's field trip to the Climate-Smart Villages in Kisumu.

Decisions:

- To include an agenda item for reflections on the field trip in future meetings
- To request CCAFS management to consider including informal interactions with stakeholders designed to identify areas of improvement and lessons learned (for example facilitated round table dialogues with translation) in future field trips
- The ISP wishes to express its appreciation for a successful field trip and thank the East Africa team for organizing it.

9) Report from External evaluation team

Simon Anderson (IIED), the lead person on the evaluation will brief the ISP on scope, progress and plans for the evaluation. There are three other evaluators: Christian Roth (CSIRO); Carmenza Robledo (ETH, Switzerland); Fawad Khan (ISET, Pakistan).

The reference group for the evaluation consists of: Sirkka Immonen (Internal Evaluation Arrangement - IEA), Charles Rice (CIAT Board), Reiner Wassmann (IRRI), Clare Stirling (CIMMYT), Walter Baethgen (IRI), Ariella Helfgott (Oxford), Manyewu Mutamba (SACAU – farmers organisation), Tobias Baedeker (World Bank), Carmen Thoennissen (SDC), Bruce Campbell (CCAFS).

The evaluation team, IEA and some of CCAFS core team met with the evaluation team in Rome and one of the evaluators (Carmenza) went to Montpellier and Paris to attend CCAFS meetings and conduct interviews.

Christian will lead on the review of SEA and Flagship 1, Fawad on South Asia and Flagship 2, Carmenza on WA and Flagship 3, and Simon on LAM, EA and Flagship 4.

Decisions:

- To note the update with the following comments:
 - Director to contact Simon Anderson to ensure the external evaluation will also cover global issues
 - PMC to suggest additional cases for Flagship 3
 - The evaluation team will explore the possibility of presenting the findings to CCAFS ahead of the initial timeline

10) CCAFS Phase 2 proposal

Shifts already made in moving to the Extension Phase

CCAFS made some major revisions in moving from Phase 1 to the Extension Phase, and at that stage, already had its vision on Phase 2. Key thrusts included:

Raising the attention on impact pathways and theories of change, and in so doing reorganized how Centers link their work to regional impact pathways;
Placing more emphasis on results-based management and thus indicators and targets;
Raising the profile of research on gender and social inclusion;
Reorganising the Flagships (with some significant changes)
Putting greater weight on regional programs and regional coordination.

These shifts in direction continue to be relevant for Phase 2. The Projects put in place for the Extension Phase were expected to continue running into Phase 2, unless the shape of CCAFS was to be drastically altered by higher governance bodies in the CGIAR. CCAFS thus expected to put together a concept note that was relatively similar to the concept note for the Extension Phase (CCAFS ISP8/9.1).

Possible future shifts for Phase 2

There are a number of areas where further changes in the thinking in the CGIAR could impact CCAFS, and where particular groups have lobbied CCAFS for change. While it would be desirable to shift the mandate or regional focus, given resources are constrained, any shift needs to also identify areas or work that should be discontinued.

Climate change now mainstreamed in all CRPs. This could imply a reduced role for CCAFS but this does not seem to be the case. However, there is a need to be better connected to all CRPs and to provide some kind of platform amongst CRPs. With this in mind, the PMC has updated its information on cross-CRP linkages (CCAFS ISP8/9.2), and plans to discuss with other CRPs their visions for such linkages. How this is done depends a lot on what the future

portfolio of CRPs looks like. If the current kinds of CRPs continue to exist, then the following ideas may be relevant:

Systems CRPs: CCAFS to provide the climate science to select no-regret options; CCAFS to assist in prioritisation of CSA options. CCAFS to continue with its Climate-Smart Village (CSV) approach until systems programs fully engage with CSA. Systems CRPs may undertake technology development, while CCAFS is more interested in processes to scale-up CSA, drawing on technologies developed in other CRPs

Policy CRP: CCAFS to engage on bringing climate into policy models, on climate –informed safety nets. CCAFS to focus on climate change adaptation and mitigation policies

Commodity CRPs. These CRPs have the mandate to develop technologies; CCAFS would provide the testing ground for such technologies in CSVs. CCAFS would work with commodity CRPs to influence their research strategies based on climate downscaling, prioritisation of options and results from field testing.

Nutrition CRP. CCAFS would work with the nutrition CRP in global policy processes, given the dual interest in being climate-smart and nutrition-smart.

NRM CRPs. These CRPs have the mandate for detailed technical work on technologies; CCAFS would focus on the scaling issues.

Splitting CCAFS. There are some pushing for a global climate change Flagship that would not necessarily be in CCAFS and also talk of removing mitigation from CCAFS. This could change the nature of CCAFS significantly.

Regional focus. CCAFS currently covers five regions. There is strong pressure from ICARDA to also focus on CWANA, and some pressure from IITA to focus on Central Africa. Without more resources it seems difficult to expand to other regions. If expanding regional focus is deemed necessary the following options could be considered: decreased Center activities in some of the current regions in order to add new regions; decreased coverage of countries in the current regions in order to expand to other countries; through linking to CRPs active in the new regions, expand CCAFS scope. The PMC favours keeping the current portfolio of Projects and Regions in the first three years of Phase 2, but making a plan to downscale activity in specific countries in the current regions, and to scale up activity in one or more countries in new regions.

New areas of research. CCAFS has sought feedback from Center Contact Points on ideas for phase 2. These include the following:

Breeding strategies. There is concern that CCAFS is not paying sufficient attention to influencing the breeding strategies of the commodity CRPs. While CCAFS has had some successes on this topic in the past, there has also been lack of interest from Centers.

More technology development. Some Centers want to see CCAFS doing more technology development in conjunction with commodity CRPs, e.g. adaptation of drought adapted materials.

More political economy. It has been argued that there is a relative lack of a political economy perspective on CSA; and this kind of perspective is going to be crucial to achieve outcomes at scale.

- Taking more of a food-system perspective. Areas of work that have been highlighted as needing attention include: Consumption, rural-urban links, post-harvest loss, life cycle analysis
- A number of Centers have argued for more work on energy

Theories of change

The ISP requested that the PMC elaborate on the theories of change, and in particular present the logic connecting the 2019 and 2025 targets.

- General CCAFS approach to TOC
This is basically laid out in the “Strategic overview of CGIAR Research programs: Part I. Theories of Change and Impact Pathways” document from the ISPC of December 2012. It should be noted that, soon after CCAFS had started implementing the shift from logical frameworks to an outcome-focused results-based management framework, it became clear that a considerable simplification of the process was needed, otherwise the time and resources spent on the process would have been crippling. This included decreasing the number and complexity of flagship indicators to ensure that expenditure of time and resources for this process was kept in proportion with CCAFS core business.
- Processes for identifying and setting targets
We undertook a participatory and iterative process with CCAFS staff, Program Director, Flagship Leaders, Regional Program Leaders, Project leaders and a wide array of partners. Initial targets were proposed and validated in relation to each theme (flagship), the various regional contexts, and the portfolio of projects. At all stages relevant literature and sources were consulted, as well as the long and rich experience and knowledge of the staff involved. We recognise that the number of beneficiaries is only one among several other measures that can be used, and CCAFS has in place a range of indicators along the impact pathways for the four flagships and five regions.
- Logic of connecting 2019 targets to the 2025 targets
If the flagship hypotheses and assumptions for the theories of change hold true (see CCAFS ISP8/9.4 CCAFS Theory of Change), the way is paved to achieve the 2025 targets. The Flagship theories of change are based on the text in the CCAFS Extension Proposal (25 August 2014) and the latest CCAFS Targets. They will need to be updated for Phase 2.

We particularly seek advise on the issue of counterfactuals in the Theory of Change (see CCAFS ISP8/9.4 CCAFS Theory of Change).

Decisions:

- To support the previous shifts in direction and their continued relevance into Phase 2
- To support adaptation and mitigation remaining under a single CRP
- To support continuing with the current regions into Phase 2, but requesting a phasing plan from regions or countries where there has been much success to new regions and countries, with the expectation that these shifts start to be made from 2019.
- To propose a CGIAR climate change platform that supports other CRPs, and through this approach work in other regions and through other modalities.
- To support a shift to deeper engagement with food system issues, and in this endeavour foster greater interaction with the nutrition CRP and Future Earth
- To support the proposed method of examining counterfactuals in the Theory of Change.

11) Reflections on draft decisions from 8 May and morning of 9 May

The ISP reflected on the draft decisions from the meeting up until now.

12) Plan of Work and Budget

12.1 2014 year-end report

CCAFS 2014 total budget was \$74.7 million including funds from the CGIAR Fund and bilateral sources. Total execution in 2014 was \$69.8 million (94%). Final and total 2014 allocated W1&2 budget from the Consortium as per the revised Financing Plan received early December 2014 was \$42.9 million. Of this, execution was \$42.4 million (99%). CCAFS is requesting from the Consortium/Fund Council to carry over \$0.472 million because of commitments made in 2014 that have yet to be completed.

Final spending on partnership was 20% of the total budget, much below the target. The gender and social inclusion research activities were in the order of \$9.5 million, approximately 14% of the total execution.

The first tranche of funds was received in early April, consisting of W2 2014 funds (0.44% of total budget in the revised Financing Plan) and W1 funds (15.33%). Thereafter, several other disbursements were made, completing 100% of the total W1&2 budgets as at end of 2014.

The final expenditure report for 2014 was put together in late April. In the coming weeks we will analyse expenditure reports to check variances from budget, and decide if any issues need follow up.

12.2 2015 budget and financial update

In 2014 for the ISP meeting in October 2014, CCAFS prepared the 2015 plan of work and budget (POWB), based on the then Consortium Office Financial Plan which targeted an annual growth in W1&2 funding by 10% from 2013 to 2014 and 10% from 2014 to 2015. A total budget of USD 68.1 million, combining all funding sources, was presented. Out of the total budget, USD 48.4 million was based on W1&2 funding for 2015 (as in the Financial Plan).

Since the budget presentation to the ISP in October 2014, the Consortium Office revised W1&2 budget target three times with USD 41.4 million for CCAFS in November 2014, then USD 40.0 million in February 2015 and finally USD 32.6 million in March 2015. The last revision between Feb and March 2015 was a 19% reduction.

Fortunately, amid all the budget reductions, DFID allocated USD 7.8 million as W2 to CCAFS to deliver on scaling up opportunities in 2015. The Consortium also approved a direct funding of USD 0.054 million to CCAFS for a gender position to be based in ILRI.

These additions make up a total 2015 W1&2 budget of USD 40.454 million. In addition, W3 EC funding of USD 3.0 million is the expected last tranche of the agreement with CCAFS in 2015. This brought overall confirmed CCAFS budget of USD 43.454 million over which the CCAFS PMC has direct control to allocate amongst activities. In addition to this, the CGIAR Centers have allocated W3 funding of USD 6.323 million and bilateral funding of USD 12.694 million (bilateral is expected to increase during the year as CGIAR Centers raise more bilateral mapped to CCAFS). The final budget, including all funding sources is now USD 62.471 million. 32% of the budget is allocated to partnerships and 13 % to gender and social inclusion.

Decisions:

- To note the final expenditure report for 2014
- To request PMC to follow up on the various issues noted in the presentation
- To support CCAFS management efforts to eliminate double overhead on transfer between centers on W1 and W2 funding
- To request that PMC do more detailed analyses to cover Theme and Region budgets, Coordinating unit, partnership and gender budget
- To note the budget reduction and approve 2015 budget as final
- To support further dialogue on low levels of bilateral funding by Worldfish and CIP
- To request a strategic analysis of the partnership trajectory, to be presented at the next meeting.

13) 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 November 2015 or later meetings:

- Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO
- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture and Climate-Smart Villages, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy
- Future partnerships between Future Earth and CCAFS
- Capacity building and sustainability in local situations/settings
- Partnership strategy for CCAFS
- Phase 2 proposal and the budget and workplan for 2016
- Finance strategy for declining W1 and W2 funds, and for increasing W3 bilateral funds

In addition, other items that are important to cover either at the coming meeting or in 2016, were discussed.

- Internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas
- Flagship 1 priority setting paper
- Paper examining the relative focus on different Flagships; and relative distribution of work amongst regions, as an input to future priority setting; paper to be based on solicited expert input
- Bibliometric analysis of CCAFS publications
- Institutions and incentives for low emissions development
- Linking knowledge and action: status and outlook
- Progress in Flagship 2 in getting synergies across CGIAR Centers

Decisions:

- To agree that the following topics be prioritised in the November meeting:

- Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO (Nov)
- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture and Climate-Smart Villages, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy
- Future partnerships between Future Earth and CCAFS
- Capacity building and sustainability in local situations/settings
- Partnership strategy for CCAFS
- Phase 2 proposal and the budget and workplan for 2016
- Finance strategy for declining W1 and W2 funds, and for increasing W3 bilateral funds

14) Future meetings, including date and place for the 9th and 10th meetings

Decisions:

- To propose that the next meeting will be a virtual meeting in October 2015, and asked

- | |
|--|
| <p>the Coordination Unit to prepare a budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- To ask the Coordination Unit to follow up with a Doodle for the 9th, 10th and 11th meeting |
|--|

15) Filling in ISP self-assessment forms to be discussed at the 9th meeting

As agreed in the annual timeline for the CCAFS ISP, the self-assessment form was discussed. It probes a member's level of satisfaction with the current performance of the ISP, compared with that member's expectation of desired ISP performance. At the end of each section, ISP members are asked to suggest actions the ISP could take to improve its performance the area of that specific ISP responsibility.

The ISP Vice-Chair is assigned responsibility to collate, summarize and analyze the results (with the assistance of the Coordination Unit), for discussion at the next meeting.

A reviewed self-assessment form was used at this meeting.

<p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- To ask the Vice-Chair to collect the results from the survey and present the results at the ISP meeting in October 2015
--

16) Any other business

There was no other business