CCAFS

11th INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING

28 – 29 September, 2016

Dakar, Senegal

MINUTES

Participants:	Brian Keating (Chair)
	Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)
	Mercedes Bustamente
	Fatima Denton
	Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza
	Tim Payn (Future Earth) (*ex officio*)
	Christof Walter
	Ruben Echeverria, CIAT BoT
Apologies:	Ram Badan Sing
	Arona Diedhiou
	Charles Rice (CIAT BoT) (*ex officio*)
Invited participants:	Core Team Members
	Sonja Vermeulen, Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-13)
	Robert Zougmoré, West Africa (for agenda items 1-13)
	Pramod Aggerwal, South Asia (for agenda items 1-13)
	Ana Maria Loboguerrero, Latin America (for agenda items 1-13)
	Leocadio Sebastian, South East Asia (for agenda items 1-13)
	Andy Jarvis, Flagship 1 (for agenda items 1-13)
	Jim Hansen, Flagship 2 (for agenda items 1-13)
	Lini Wollenberg, Flagship 3 (for agenda items 1-13)
	Philip Thornton, Flagship 4 (for agenda items 1-13)
	Sophia Huyer, Gender and Social Inclusion (for agenda items 1-13)
	Julian Rivera, Coordination Unit (for agenda items 1-13)
	Maren Radeny, East Africa (for agenda items 1-13)

1. **Welcome by the Chair and announcements**

The Chair opens the meeting and welcomes the participants. Ratih Septivita provides practical information about lunch, dinner, etc.

2. **Agenda, minutes, matters arising**
   2.1 Adoption of agenda
   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 10th 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 the background paper (CCAFS ISP11/2.3 Status and Follow-ups from Previous ISP Meetings).

Matters arising

All of the decisions taken at the previous meeting are covered in substantive agenda items in this meeting.

Documents:
CCAFS ISP11/2.1.1 Agenda
CCAFS ISP11/2.1.2 Annotated Agenda
CCAFS ISP11/2.2.1 CCAFS ISP10 Minutes
CCAFS ISP11/2.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous ISP Meetings
CCAFS ISP11/2.2.3 List of Acronyms and abbreviations
Decisions:
- To adopt the agenda

   2.3 Updates from ex officio members

Program Director

Since the last meeting of the ISP, some of the main activities of the CCAFS core team have been finalising the Phase II proposal, completing reports for various donors (Irish, DFID), preparing the response to the External Evaluation, and completing the evaluation of 2015 projects. This last couple of months have felt like the first time we can give attention to CCAFS in a broader manner.

At the time of the meeting, we await the final decisions on the Phase II proposal, and thus have not prepared a detailed Plan of Work and Budget for 2017. We essentially present what we have in the Phase II proposal for 2017.

CCAFS has been operating with two key staff positions unfilled – that of the Regional Program Leader

for East Africa and the Science officer for Flagship 2. This is because of resignations during the period of budget uncertainty. We will wait for the Phase II budget decisions prior to filling the RPL position, but have gone forward in Flagship 2 with a new hire because of the many large bilateral projects involved there.

We note the following opportunities for the CCAFS ISP to engage with CCAFS core team and scientists in the coming months:

a) UNFCCC COP22, Marrakech, 7 - 18 November 2016, particularly 13th November ("Ag Day")
b) Science meeting, Galway, Ireland, 24-28 April 2017

Future Earth

Future Earth continues to develop. All the new structures and positions have been filled. Future Earth's five Global Hubs are based in Colorado, Montreal, Paris, Stockholm and Tokyo. Regional Centres are operational in Asia, Europe, the Middle-East and North Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean, while Regional Offices are emerging in Africa and South Asia. National Structures are also forming in countries across the planet. Paul Shrivastava is the Executive Director, and the Science Committee is chaired by Dr Mark Stafford Smith, with Vice-Chairs Professor Melissa Leach and Dr Belinda Reyers. The Engagement Committee is chaired by Farooq Ullah, with Vice-Chairs Tim Payn and Ruth Wolstenholme.

One focus area is on Knowledge Action Networks, designed to focus on major issues in global change science and stimulate Future Earth projects and other scientists to develop greater collaboration amongst themselves. CCAFS is participating in establishing the KAN on the Food-Energy-Water nexus, and in so doing is also linked to another CRP, namely WLE.

Future Earth values its position on the ISP (soon to be ISC) and, as described in the Phase II proposal, will endeavour to collate Strategic Partner views and bring them to the attention of the ISC

CIAT Board of Trustees (BoT)

Congratulations to CCAFS for the tremendous contributions it has made to drive the climate agenda forward to safeguard our future food supply in the face of climate challenges. CCAFS continues as a strong program and CIAT looks forward to lead the program into Phase II. CCAFS was highly ranked in the ISPC review for Phase II and is well positioned in the next phase as an integrating CRP. We look forward to the final approval from the System Council in November.

The next CIAT BoT meeting will be held in November in Cali. The CIAT BoT welcomes the opportunity to have the Director and ISP Chair at that meeting, given that they were not present in person in previous meetings due to cost considerations. The large reductions in CGIAR Windows 1&2 funds in 2015 made implementation difficult and affected inter-Center collaborations in CCAFS. The funding challenges will require CCAFS to raise funds from bilateral donors

3. State of play of CCAFS, including 2015 report, and reflections on lessons learned

2015

Apart from the budget issues in 2015 (a series of cuts to the whole CGIAR), CCAFS had a good performance in 2015. The external reviewer on the CCAFS report finished the review with "Ranking: Absolutely excellent! It would be ludicrous to ask for more." The review noted that the main challenge in 2015 was managing the budget cut of 32% in W1-2.

To give you a flavour of the outcome achievements, these are some of the more significant ones:

- Science contributes to programming and implementation of about 100m USD IFAD financing for farmers' resilience.
- Climate-Smart Villages scaled out in Haryana, India
- Scenario-guided policy development in 7 countries
- Climate information services in Senegal reach 7 million persons
- Agriculture is a key part of post-2015 UNFCCC agreements
- Scaling climate-smart dairy practices in Kenya – dissemination reaching some 600,000 farmers
- Scientifically-designed index insurance protects a million Maharashtra farmers from increasing extreme rainfall events.

CCAFS produced nine major products and nine major tools. Performance on gender increased substantially between 2014 and 2015 due to greater investment in gender leadership. This enabled CCAFS to contribute to major products, such as the tool ***WB-IFAD-FAO Gender Sourcebook Module on Gender and CSA***. A few other examples of tools and products include:

- ***CSA Plan***
- ***CSA country profiles*** (developed for Sri Lanka, Kenya, Rwanda, Nicaragua and Uruguay to inform national decision-making).
- ENACTS (***Enhancing National Climate Services***)
- PICSA (***Participatory Integrated Climate Services for Agriculture***)
- ***aspirational mitigation target for agriculture to limit warming by 2°C***
- ***SAMPLES (***web platform provides methods for low-cost measurement, a database of Tier 2 emission factors for smallholder farming, and other resources related to GHG quantification).
- ***IMPACT partial equilibrium model***
- ***Guide to UNFCCC negotiations on agriculture***

CCAFS continued to build and maintain several open-access databases. For example, 191,912 files were downloaded from CCAFS-Climate (FP1, FP4), which contains downscaled GCM data (30.03 TB data downloaded; 11.441 unique visits; 679 new users).

CCAFS scientists produced 305 publications in 2015, including peer reviewed journal articles, policy

briefs, books, book chapters and working papers. 85% of 140 peer-reviewed articles were published in ISI journals, 56% of 140 peer-reviewed articles were open access.

Phase II

2015 was the first year of implementation of a new research portfolio (for the "extension phase" of 2015-2016). This was in preparation for Phase II and essentially set the framework for the Phase II proposal. It is based on [a theory of change (ToC) from project to global levels](). Our experiences in 2015-2016 set us up for a fast-start to Phase II. The one area where 2015-2016 does not match what Phase II needs to address is CCAFS as an Integrating-CRP (meaning that we need to link to all other CRPs to mainstream climate change issues). This needs some thought in the coming months.

External Evaluation and synthesis report on evaluations

During the last period CCAFS management has been busy with responding to the External Evaluation (see forthcoming agenda item). There has also been a synthesis report of all the IEA external evaluations. The ISP previously called for an analysis of the synthesis report for issues of relevance to CCAFS. The synthesis report may be of value to those looking for a birds' eye view of the whole CGIAR, but is of limited value to any specific CGIAR as it is unclear which recommendations apply to which CRPs, given the diversity that the CRPs embrace. Some conclusions from the synthesis, where CCAFS was specifically mentioned, include the following (I have only picked out those with negative connotations, given the opportunity that these may suggest where improvement is needed):

1. The synthesis reviewers suggest more focus on priority setting. They noted the CCAFS evaluation "urged stronger priority setting in selecting countries with the best prospects of influence and to target most climatically vulnerable groups."
2. They noted that the CCAFS evaluation "found a need to strengthen the ToCs at regional and flagship levels by better definition of assumptions and risks."
3. On partnerships they suggested improved processes: "Even in those cases where CRPs had developed a formal Partnership Strategy (e.g., WLE, CCAFS and A4NH), the evaluations saw room for improvement, especially in terms of providing clear operational guidelines for the choice of partners."
4. On capacity development, "several evaluations (e.g., WLE, CCAFS, AAS, PIM) point out that these activities have not been guided by an explicit capacity development strategy, and criteria for priority setting were often not clear."
5. On RBM, "While noting substantial progress, several evaluations (FTA, WLE, CCAFS, PIM, A4NH) express serious concerns regarding the realism of the emerging" systems. While not indicating which CRP they applied to, their concerns related to: unrealistic assumptions about the attributability of development outcome indicators to CRP research; underestimation of the resources required to adequately monitor the development outcome indicators across the entire portfolio; and heavy reporting requirements that may undermine staff morale.
6. On competitive fund allocation, "evaluations of A4NH, PIM and CCAFS that most extensively use competitive grants caution that the processes need to be much more transparent"

#1 has two components: country choices, which will be returned in 2018 as previously agreed with the ISP; and selection of focus beneficiaries, where we believe a focus on the most climatically vulnerable groups is too simplistic an approach. CCAFS management believes that a number of the issues raised do not justify immediate follow up, in particular: #2 (ToC logic has its limitations, which the synthesis

report also acknowledge; we hope to write a peer reviewed paper on CCAFS perspective on ToC logic), #3 (where we believe the bulk of partners are selected strategically, in line with impact pathway thinking; in addition it has to be recognised that serendipity plays a role) and #6 (CCAFS is not convinced that we can be more transparent than we were in the competitive process that was run previously). On #4, CCAFS has always had a capacity development strategy so this statement may not apply to CCAFS, though they may be correct that criteria for capacity development are not clear (though even here we question the need for detailed specific criteria – CCAFS believes that capacity strengthening has to be done in relation to impact pathways and theories of change). #5 is part of a later agenda item (the issues raised are all well-known to CCAFS management).

Lessons Learnt

In terms of the CRP Performance Matrix, two of the eight targets for 2015 were not achieved. Both of these (Flagship 1, Target 2; Flagship 3, Target 2) are for substantially new areas of work and progress has been slower than expected – in hindsight we were over-ambitious on the likelihood of quick wins. In addition, for Flagship 3, activities related to this target were disproportionally reduced by budget cuts, so future targets will need to be reduced. The under-performance on these targets is more than compensated for by exceeding the other targets in those Flagships. Of the 8 targets in CCAFS, five were exceeded in 2015 – we probably set the initial targets too low.

This was the first year of implementing a system of targets and indicators across the entire portfolio, integrated amongst projects, regions and Flagships. Having easily measured targets that can be annually assessed is regarded as very useful in measuring progress of project partners. But given this is the first year of operation, there are a number of lessons to improve the system.

"Ease of measuring" an indicator comes at the expense of detailed quantitative evidence of impact and is largely focused on reported outcomes, i.e. use of research by key non-research agencies along the impact pathway. Thus the current indicator system of CCAFS has to be supplemented by more detailed evaluation of progress every few years. We believe this more detailed evaluation should be based on ex-post impact assessments, so that evaluation is focused on some high performing areas/IDOs, rather than attempting to be comprehensive across all IDOs, as a comprehensive approach will be extremely resource demanding.

Because the outcome case studies are based on reporting by project participants, we have found external evaluation of the outcomes very valuable (two external evaluators count 2/3 of the final score for a reported outcome, while two core team members count 1/3). The external evaluators read the outcome case studies and associated validation studies with the eyes of users of the research, and provide independent objectivity. Through the use of external evaluators, it is believed that the indicator values given in the Performance Matrix can be reported with confidence.

In a previous change of direction, CCAFS downsized a "knowledge for action" cross-cutting topic and replaced it by a theme of gender and social inclusion. We believe that this has been instrumental in positioning CCAFS for better outputs and outcomes on gender. However, we look forward to even greater performance in this area. For example, CCAFS needs to develop better gender impact assessment methodologies for going forward, a priority for 2016.

Communication and knowledge sharing is seen as a critical success factor to deliver impact, and so, for example, all communicators were trained in impact pathway thinking. Cross-CRP communication activities have been very productive.

Documents:
CCAFS ISP 11 3.1 IEA Synthesis report final draft
Decisions:
- To note the update for 2015 and the lessons learnt
- To place the following topics on the list of potential future agenda items (including consideration for potential inter-connections):
   a) Country targeting: how can it be improved in readiness for the 2018 region and country priority setting process
   b) Beneficiary targeting: climate vulnerable, poorest of the poor, market-connected?
   c) Insights into Theory of Change thinking: lessons learnt
   d) Fund-raising strategy; lessons learnt and future strategy

---

4. **Independent Evaluation Arrangement external evaluation of CCAFS**

Our overall impression of the external evaluation process is not positive. Perhaps the most interesting part was the one-on-one meetings or initial meeting with evaluators when specific issues could be explored and discussed, but these happened early in the process. While most would regard the report as very positive to CCAFS, we question the benefits relative to the costs. Many issues raised were already on our agenda, and some parts of the report feel as if they were written to fill space. The timing of the report was also problematic, with us getting various forms of the report a few days before submission deadlines for the pre-proposal and proposal.

Perhaps the value of the report is that it gives more urgency to CCAFS core team to address some of the specific issues raised, and given that it does not tell us much new, gives us confidence in our own reflections and management and governance system.

The official management response, in the background paper, focuses on the recommendations. We deal with some of these in the next agenda item.

Apart from the recommendations, we have identified 12 issues we think we should discuss as a management team, namely:

1. Can we be clearer in our communication of the CSA and CSV concepts and their role in CCAFS?
2. How can we up the game on trade-off analyses amongst CSA (and other) objectives?
3. What internal CGIAR capacity strengthening initiatives should be undertaken by CCAFS?
4. Can we write a peer-reviewed paper to address ToC issues, our hypothesis that over-formulation of ToCs wastes valuable resources, and our position on the role of science in development?
5. To what extent can we get more detailed (national and project) communication and engagement strategies, and more detailed impact pathways and ToCs without over-burdening management and

project participants? (e.g. the evaluation notes "input-output relationships that are insufficiently explicit")

6. How can we raise the game on outcome reporting and impact assessment?
7. How can we limit the number of poorer quality outputs in a very decentralized management system? Is it indeed a problem?
8. Is there anything we can do to strengthen the components of the delivery systems? ("…….Given the challenging and resource intensive nature of climate change and agriculture research, CCAFS may consider concentrating on fewer but very high quality knowledge products, and to increase the focus on strengthening components of the delivery systems of IPGs to better achieve the goals of CCAFS research and those of the CGIAR."
9. How can we get even better internal communication and transparency regarding decisions, in a resource-limited system?
10. To what extent are we still being too science-driven, given much effort has been put into shifting to stakeholder-driven research?
11. To what extent are we embracing non-farm livelihood options and wider influences on rural trajectories?
12. How can CCAFS get greater integration within the Program—among projects, FPs and RPs—and with other CRPs.

Documents:
CCAFS ISP11/4.1 CCAFS External evaluation Volume I_report
CCAFS ISP11/4.2 CCAFS External evalutation Volume II_annexes
CCAFS ISP11/4.3 CCAFS Management response to the external evaluation
Decisions:
- To note the management response (previously approved by circulation)
- To note the follow up questions that the management team will address in future
  management meetings
- To encourage CCAFS to develop thinking about program direction in relation to non-farm
  livelihood options and rural-urban linkages, and to bring this topic to a future ISP meeting

---

5. CCAFS Phase II

CCAFS received comments on its Phase II submission from the ISPC and Donor Effectiveness Working Group (see four background documents). In the ISPC review, four CRPs received the top rating of Excellent (CCAFS, A4NH, RTB, RICE). CCAFS along with RTB did best in the analysis of Flagships, with 3 of the 4 CCAFS Flagships regarded as strong, and one as moderate. In the donor review, CCAFS overall average score was in the top four (with WHEAT, MAIZE and WLE). For the donor review of Flagships, CCAFS was in the top five for average score (with WHEAT, FTA, WLE, A4NH). The donor group placed 8 CRPs in its category 1 – "well regarded by the donor perspective reviewers at the CRP level, and for all proposed flagships; the CRP proposal is considered suitable for funding decisions by the CGIAR system as an integrated research program with all its proposed flagships integral to the CRP". We have made a preliminary examination of all the weaknesses identified in the reviews, and have concluded that they are not difficult to address or counter (see background paper).

With Annexes the proposal is 200+ pages, so we have also prepared a more readable 10-page summary (which was not part of the official submission). The framing for Phase II is not very new to the ISP, as we positioned the Extension Phase as what we would propose in Phase II.

To note that in relation to comments, we now have a new ordering of Flagships, but their content is a continuation from the Extension Phase, namely:

- FP1: Priorities and Policies for CSA;
- FP2: Climate-Smart Technologies and Practices.
- FP3: Low Emissions Development;
- FP4: Climate Services and Safety Nets.

A general issue is whether we are primarily productivity focussed or are more broadly focussed on food security and food systems. We have aspired in the past to the broader focus, and this is supported by the external evaluation which calls for greater attention to food security (recommendation #5). An FP1 cluster of activity is on "food and nutrition security futures under climate change", FP3 has a cluster of activity on "reducing food loss and waste" and FP4 has strengthened partnerships with food security early warning and response agencies.

Related largely to FP2, the external evaluation calls for a broadening of the CCAFS framework from the current focus on agricultural technologies and implementation through CSVs (recommendation #8). The external evaluation also calls for generating of evidence on climate smart solutions at the local level (recommendation #9). We believe this is underway.

On FP3, the external evaluation notes that activities are rather isolated from other FPs (recommendation #10. In another broader recommendation (#6) greater integration is called for across all operating units of CCAFS. The core team is examining mechanisms to enhance integration.

CCAFS will continue to work in the current five focus areas and associated countries, with some small modifications. The External review recommends (recommendation #3) that CCAFS should conduct a geographic prioritization of its activities refocusing on countries with lower CSA research capability. We already agreed with the ISP that this would be done after two years of implementation of Phase II.

A key difference from the Extension Phase is that CCAFS has been designated as an "Integrative CRP" that must link to all other CRPs to mainstream climate change issues throughout the CGIAR. Becoming an Integrative CRP may be the single most challenge for CCAFS in Phase II. We see this happening through five mechanisms:

(1) Impact pathways. An integrated impact pathway focus helps to shape partnerships, cross-CRP collaboration and build common purpose. The external evaluation refers to some of this targeting, e.g. "CCAFS should adjust the sub-IDOs that the Program targets to make them operational for Program planning and management" (recommendation #4). We cannot unilaterally adjust sub-IDOs as this requires agreement across the whole CGIAR, but we will work with whatever the CGIAR eventually decides on.

(2) Learning Platforms (LPs). CCAFS will host six LPs – these will involve a body of cross-CRP research and engagement activities. They are as follows:
- LP1: Ex-ante evaluation and decision support for climate-smart options (including downscaled climate data, regional climate outlook, prioritization frameworks) (Part of FP1)

- LP2: Participatory evaluation of CSA technologies and practices in Climate-Smart Villages (including integrated assessment of CSA options) (Part of FP2)
- LP3: Identifying priorities and options for low-emissions development (including guidelines for GHG measurement, identifying priority mitigation options) (Part of FP3)
- LP4: Weather-related agricultural insurance products and programs (including global analyses to identify constraints and opportunities, lessons from pilots) (Part of FP4)
- LP5: CSA, gender and social inclusion (supporting CSA gender specialists on climate-specific topics)
- LP6: Partnerships and capacity for scaling CSA (position CGIAR as leading global research organization for developing country food systems and climate change; manage national to global partnerships for climate change policy impact and scaling CSA)

(3) Climate Change Contact Points. CCAFS has established Contact Points in each Centre. Contact Points will facilitate two-way flow of strategic information between CCAFS and other CRPs in their Centre and identify additional opportunities for collaboration.

(4) Project Activity Planning. Each CCAFS project, and future CCAFS projects, will identify in the "Planning and Reporting System" (MARLO) the linkages with other CRPs, including levels of coinvestment.

(5) Internal Learning. To ensure success in the Cross-CRP collaboration strategy, attention will be given to internal learning. This will consist of two elements. (1) Cross-CRP collaboration will be one element in our Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy. For example, annual work plans for each LP will be developed, and will be annually assessed by relevant participants. (2) The effectiveness of the above mechanisms will depend on the skills of the individuals, e.g. Contact Points, leaders of LPs. All these individuals will have annual appraisal (including 360 degree feedback).

Partnerships remain important in Phase II. We have now designated ca. 40 strategic partners. These are largely global and regional organisations. National partners are critically important to CCAFS but including them in this designation would bring the strategic partner number into the 100s, thus Regional Program Leaders have a key role to ensure good partnerships with the multiple national level organisations with which we work. We propose that the strategic partners meet about once per year, in the sidelines of major global meetings, to reflect on CCAFS progress and operations, and provide feedback to the ISC via the Future Earth ex officio member.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP11/5.1 CCAFS Phase II proposal

CCAFS ISP11/5.2 CCAFS Phase II proposal summary

CCAFS ISP11/5.3 ISPC summary assessment of CRPs

CCAFS ISP11/5.4 ISPC assessment of CCAFS

CCAFS ISP11/5.5 Donor summary scores of CRPs

CCAFS ISP11/5.6 Donor assessment of CCAFS

CCAFS ISP11/5.7 CCAFS preliminary response to issues raised by ISPC and donors

Decisions:

- To note the CCAFS Phase II proposal
- To congratulate the management team and all involved, and to note the resoundingly positive responses from the ISPC and the donor working group.
- To concur with the importance placed on CCAFS as an integrative CRP, and to take note that integration is a two-way street between CCAFS and the entities to be part of the integration.

> - To request a summary statement of what's different in CCAFS between phase 1 and phase 2 and to communicate it widely.
> - To urge pragmatism in relation to the demands on management, to recognise the trade-offs involved in taking certain management decisions, and to recognise that resources are declining, particularly in relation to the imperative of protecting CCAFS's well-earned reputation for delivery.
> - To add a stock-taking/ reflection agenda item to the ISC meeting in 2018 with regard to the transition of strategy and operational practice from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

6. CCAFS Science Issues

6.1 Field trip – reflections on key questions

In line with some fundamental questions around the CSV approach (see also agenda 6.2), the field trip has two major objectives:

- Discuss the fundamental questions and analyze how globally the CSV model needs to be revisited. This will help identify key lessons, strengths of the approach, and gaps that need more focus.
- Visit case studies from the Daga-Birame CSV that demonstrate different components of the CSV as well as the trade-offs and co-benefits that different combinations of options have for different stakeholders, including women.

The key questions posed for the field trip are as follows:

- What does a CSV approach looks like?
- How integrated/linked are the different components of the CSV approach?
- What are the research questions, what questions need modification, and what research gaps are there?
- What minimum datasets are collected, and is that sufficient?
- How is the functionality and success of the approach assessed?
- What scaling up pathways have been defined? (Adoption pathways, policy engagement, scaling up opportunities, etc).

A background document provides for more detailed information (the Daga-Birame case study and the field trip guide). ISP members are requested to reflect on the documents and field trip results to recommend the way forward for CSV implementation. This portion of the agenda is focused on Daga-Birame; more general CSV issues are discussed under 6.2.

> **Documents:**
> CCAFS ISP11/6.1.1 Field trip concept note
> CCAFS ISP11/6.1.2 Case study Daga Birame CSV
> CCAFS ISP11/6.1.3 Field trip guide
> **Decisions**:
> - To thank Robert Zougmoré and the full team involved from CCAFS and partners for the field trip report and background documents.

6.2 Global science frame for CSVs

CCAFS has developed the Climate-Smart Village (CSV) approach as a scalable approach to improving the resilience of smallholder farming communities to a variable and changing climate, and, where appropriate, to reducing GHG emissions. CSVs bring together global and locally-relevant knowledge on CSA practices, technologies and services to work synergistically with institutional and policy interventions.

CCAFS started piloting the CSV approach in 2012 in Africa (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda) and South Asia (Bangladesh, India and Nepal) and then in 2014 extended the approach to Latin America (Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua) and Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam). The main aim of implementing the CSV approach was to test, through participatory methods, technological and institutional options for dealing with climate change in agriculture; with the aim of scaling up the appropriate options and drawing out lessons for policy makers from local to global levels. Currently there are 22 CSV sites facilitated by CCAFS across all the focal regions, but partner activities are expanding the number of CSVs to thousands.

The approach involves working with communities from village to district scales to implement actions dealing with climate change. Researchers, local partners and farmers collaborate to test, co-develop and adopt CSA, and provide evidence for, and demonstrate, best-bet CSA technical and institutional options that deserve investments for scaling up. With funding challenges, activities in some of the initial CSVs have been significantly scaled back, but on the other hand external organisations have adopted the concept, especially in South Asia.

While a lot of work and success stories have been developed around the CSVs, some ISP recommendations from previous field trips suggest the need for more clarity on the CSV approach, and greater clarity on the fundamental research questions that drive the CSV approach or can be answered through the approach. In addition, the CCAFS external evaluation provided some critiques on various aspects such as: the extent to which other scales than village (for example watershed or landscape) are better for implementation in certain contexts; the need for peer-reviewed publications that demonstrate the scientific rationale around the CSV approach; the degree to which off-farm options are examined as an adaptation strategy; work on better criteria to define what is climate smart and developing frameworks to underpin trade-off analysis.

Some key features of CSVs are:
- Global knowledge is made available for evaluating and promoting adoption of integrated and innovative CSA technologies, practices and services at local scale under different climatic and socio-economic scenarios
- Founded on the principles of participatory action research
- Provide a platform for multi stakeholder collaborative work, and facilitating co-development of scaling mechanisms towards landscapes, sub national and national levels
- Capacity strengthening of various stakeholders is part of the approach.

Research in CSVs revolve around understanding the relative synergies and trade-offs of different CSA portfolios in terms of productivity, adaptation and mitigation outcomes and their context-dependencies; gender-, social-, and nutrition- dimensions of promising CSA options; and scaling- up strategies. Different

CSVs often have context-specific questions important to local stakeholders but there is sufficient commonality in the key questions across CSVs in order to build cross-CRP lessons.

The research is likely to provide several outputs (CCAFS/ISP11/6.2.1 for details) and eventually outcomes and impact. A few initial papers have been published. A more systematic documentation of the approach, processes, case studies, and lessons learnt is almost ready for submission to a journal (CCAFS ISP1/6.2.2). Additional papers using simulation models and field data are being developed to illustrate the approach in different regions, especially to understand the productivity-adaptation-mitigation dimensions of CSA portfolios in current and future climate change scenarios.

This agenda item will seek to identify lessons that need to be brought into Phase II.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP11/6.2.1 The Climate-Smart Village Approach: A novel strategy for scaling up climate-smart agriculture options

CCAFS ISP1/ 6.2.2 The Climate-Smart Village Approach: An Integrative and Multi-Scale Strategy for Reducing the Vulnerability of Smallholder Farmers to Climatic Risks

Decisions:

 - To note the progress and to endorse the merit of the CSV approach in scaling-up context-specific CSA options
 - To recognize that there is a strong need to set up a robust framework for analysis.
 - To use CSVs to derive knowledge for guiding investments; rather than as lighthouses for local development.
 - The following issues were regarded as needing attention in future CSV implementation:
   - There is need to identify early wins in which a significant impact opportunity is supported by a sound science case. This could involve the fast tracking of a small number of priority case studies in which the scientific evidence base for key practice change or policy change actions is demonstrated.
   - Wherever possible, the expertise of CGIAR and partners in relevant "agri-food systems" should be drawn into the design and evaluation of farm level CSA technologies and practices.
   - To recognise and analyse risks of the CSV approach and manage these risks through appropriate actions.
   - There could be more focus on inclusive business-led development and value chain approaches – either directly or via linkages and partnerships to other activities.
   - To recogonise the need for a range of communication materials (e.g. peer-reviewed papers, short values propositions on the CSV approach)
   - To review and update the ISP on all the above by 2018

6.3 Measuring gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R

In October 2015, the ISP requested a report at the next ISP meeting on measuring the gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R system.

The CGIAR has established a Task Force to operationalize the new CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework with a suite of Indicators within a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MEL). It is working with a Core Group and several CG Communities of Practice, including one on Gender led by the System Senior

Gender Advisor. The Policies, Institutions and Markets CRP (PIM) is also contributing to the gender discussions. The results of this process will feed into MARLO, the new P&R system for Phase II which will be used by the ICRPs for planning and reporting.

In the Phase II proposal, CCAFS reports against two sets of indicators for reporting gender:

– It has identified targets and outcomes for 6 sub-IDOs with gender dimensions
– 4 CRP-Level indicators request sex-disaggregated data.

In the current P&R, gender is requested in Outcomes, Outputs and Input/Budgets. Most of the GSI elements in the current P&R are qualitative inputs which are not easily summarized and require additional work to collect and analyse data from different sources. There is a need for more easily accessible quantitative indicators on both gender and youth. Currently questions on gender and social inclusion (GSI) outcomes do not distinguish between gender and youth, requesting information on "gender and social inclusion". There is also a need to identify indicators which indicate how and whether women are benefitting from CCAFS practices, technologies, capacity building, and other activities in a way that goes beyond their level or percentage of participation.

There are two levels of MARLO / P&R for CCAFS to address in the process to develop the GSI and youth MEL framework in Phase II:

i) CCAFS can be actively engaged in the CG system initiative to develop gender indicators at the system level for the CRP portfolio.
ii) CCAFS defines what is required to measure GSI and youth/age at the CRP level in its Phase II programme.

The following suggestions are made to improve measurement of gender and youth IDOs in the P&R (ie the future MARLO):

1. CCAFS will monitor impacts on sub-IDOs through a) outcome case studies and b) ex-post impact assessments until more information on measurement of sub-IDOs is provided by the CGIAR
2. To improve reporting on gender and youth in outcomes in the CCAFS P&R, it is suggested to request information on "gender, youth and/or social inclusion dimensions", which will ensure differentiation between gender and youth focused outcomes.
3. In order to track how projects are contributing to the (CCAFS) sub-IDOs, a pop-up question could be included to indicate which sub-IDOs are targeted in the project and what progress has been made towards achieving targeted outcomes.
4. CCAFS will continue to report on the current CRP level indicators defined by the System Office for 2016. In addition, in 2017 CCAFS will report on the indicators proposed under the sub-IDOs for Phase II.
5. It is suggested to include questions on whether an impact assessment or gender analysis has been undertaken as part of a project or outcome: "Information or explanation of the impact of this outcome on gender and/or youth" and "Evidence of assessment of gender and/or youth impacts; and/or evidence of gender analysis".

6. It is suggested that the upcoming workshop on Implementing Gender and CSA: A Framework for Action identify 1-2 indicators or questions to be submitted to the CG process to identify SRF indicators.
7. In the section on Deliverables, it is suggested to provide the option of adding a youth tag to deliverables, in addition to the gender tagging option (which has been approved for MARLO in Phase II).

Documents:
CCAFS ISP11/6.3.1 Measuring gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R
CCAFS ISP11/6.3.2 Measuring gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R (presentation)
Decisions:
- To note and approve the suggested recommendations to improve measurement of gender and youth separately in the CCAFS P&R and MARLO, including any additional suggestions from the ISP.
- To forward recommendations to improve the measurement of gender and youth to the CG Task Force on Indicators and the CGIAR Gender Community of Practice
- To agree that the recommendations not integrated into MARLO at the system level should be considered for implementation at the CCAFS level in Phase II.

---

7. Partnerships

At the 9th ISP meeting, held in Nairobi in 2015, there was a detailed session on partnerships and the ISP requested CCAFS to implement several decisions. The purpose of this session is to report back on implementation of the ISP's five decisions:

1. Prioritise bilateral fund-raising to support partnerships at the regional level.

The fund-raising strategy targets bilateral funds. With CCAFS strong emphasis on outcomes and thus partnerships, bilateral fund raising has to support partnerships at the local, national and regional level.

2. Prioritise regional partners in recruiting up to six additional Strategic Partners for CCAFS Phase II.

CCAFS now has two Strategic Partners from each of Latin America, Africa and Asia.

3. Noted again the recommendation from the EC/IFAD review suggesting that CCAFS convene a stakeholder consultation each year in conjunction with an ISP meeting.

For 2015 and 2016, these consultations should be part of the Phase II planning process, including the GCARD 3 process. Looking forward, this stakeholder consultation will be catered for by the PAC, with the first meeting scheduled for April 2017 in Galway, Ireland.

4. Noted need to manage partner and stakeholder expectations with respect to CCAFS funds under Phase II.

Partners have been engaged throughout the Phase II proposal writing period, with funding uncertainties and levels made explicit.

5. Noted need for additional analysis of partnerships, including documentation of funding to and outcomes by partners

Analyses of past outcomes suggests that partners have been very important to outcomes. CCAFS is under multiple pressures in relation to partnership funds; and in the last year two of the major donors have requested information on how CCAFS funds flow back to partners in their own country. A high proportion of funds do indeed go to Advanced Research Institutes (ARIs) in Developed countries (partly a result of Flagship Leaders being based in ARIs).

Documents:

CCAFS ISP11/7.1 CCAFS Partnership

Decisions:

- As a management strategy to ensure accountability and to promote CCAFS alignment with the broader CGIAR intent on partnering, CCAFS should continue to improve the way in which its diverse range of partners and partnerships are described, in terms of roles, geographies, finances and business models.
- Two years into CCAFS Phase II, a more detailed financial picture of the estimates for partners' allocation should be made.

---

8. CCAFS Risk Catalogue

The CCAFS management team reviewed the risk catalogue in September 2016. One of the risks was removed from the top risk category that related to the shift to Phase II resulting in loss of strategic focus, less impact focus, and less donor support (#16 in risk catalogue). CCAFS management has managed to retain the central concepts of CCAFS into phase II.

Three of the top four risks remain as before:

1. Funding stability from year to year and going into Phase 2 (#12). The challenges of the funding environment remain as strong as ever, with no certainty of an annual budget well into the operating year. 2016 has been slightly better, with few changes in budget this year.

2. Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS (#4). This has been addressed in other agenda items.

3. Weak commitment and/or capacity of CGIAR Centers to deliver a cohesive body of CGIAR Climate Change science given the incorporation of CC issues in all CRPs (#11). This risk relates to how CCAFS handles its role as an Integrating CRP (ICRP). Much effort will be needed to shape the ICRP role of CCAFS. CCAFS management believes this risk could possibly be down-rated further, as the Phase II concept is regarded as strong. As actions in other CRPs are not under control of CCAFS management, we keep this risk as likely for the time being.

CCAFS management has added a new risk to the top category, namely loss and erosion of funding (#13) which increases uncertainty and reduces partner trust and critical mass of research to have impact. The decrease in funds to FLs and RPLs means loss of critical synthesis and cross cutting work. Loss of funding also means CCAFS loses leverage to align Centers' research to the program.

A number of new risks have been added to the catalogue, but their likelihood is only moderate, namely: (a) Heavy investment in national governments whose leaders might change and (b) Political mobilization against mitigation at UNFCCC, country and NGO levels. CCAFS does much work at policy levels and thus risks doing work that is discounted by new governments as key stakeholders change. A special challenge for Flagship 3 is the lack of commitment to the mitigation agenda by many of the countries where CCAFS works.

In response to the comments by the external evaluation in relation to staff burn out, CCAFS management raised the risk rating of risk #18, though it is still not in the top risk category.

Documents:
CCAFS ISP11/8.1 CCAFS Risk catalogue 2016
Decisions:
- To incorporate the new risk #13 into risk #11 (third in annotated agenda list of high risks) to represent the combined risk of reduced funding and additional responsibility as an I-CRP.

---

9. Results based management in relation to fund allocation

The proposed performance management system is in the background paper. A draft version was circulated to Contact Points for their comments. All CCAFS Projects were evaluated at 2015 year end, using the method proposed for projects. Project Leaders were also asked for their comments on the method.

A key challenge is reducing management burden, for CCAFS core staff, Contact Points and Project Leaders, while still having good reporting and rigorous assessment.

To summarise, it is proposed that all <u>Projects</u> are rated for the following criteria (weights in brackets):

1. Progress towards outputs (20%)
2. Progress towards outcomes (35%)
3. Reflection of CCAFS principles (communications gender, cross-CRP/Center linkages, partnerships, bilateral funding, good financial management) (15%)
4. Response of team to the unexpected, ability to adapt and self-reflect   (15%)
5. Quality of reporting, including the submission of deliverables and making them accessible (15%)
   It is proposed that Centers are rated on the following core variables:
   1) Project leaderships (a score derived from the above Project evaluation) (30%)
   2) Impact assessments – has the Center done the appropriate level of high quality impact assessment studies? (15%)
   3) Publications, with some kind of weighting related to the impact factor of the journals. (15%)
   4) % bilateral expenditure – overall, is the Center contributing to the CCAFS budget (10%)
   5) % partnership expenditure – is the Center contributing to the CCAFS ideal of a partnership model of operating (10%)
   6) % expenditure to gender and social inclusion activities – is the Center allocating sufficient funds to gender and social inclusion (5%)
   7) Gender and social inclusion activities and publications – is the Center committed to getting high quality research on gender and social inclusion (10%)
   8) Timely and good reporting (5%)

Additional variables could be added when CCAFS as a program fails to meet high standards. The variables to be added in any specific year would be selected in consultation with the ISC based on their assessment of issues where improvement is needed.

The above evaluations would be done on an annual basis. A key aspect would be internal learning, where we would ask Project Leaders (for part a above) and Center Contact Points (for b) for their comments on the results, whether the evaluation has overlooked something, and how the performance could be improved. This would hopefully initiate a dialogue to discuss the issues and, overall, lead to enhanced performance. Given time limitations and the budget realities, we don't propose to use results for annual performance bonuses. Instead, performance evaluations will be used to make decisions about the portfolio in the second period of Phase II (2020-2022). In addition, should there be changes in budget (either positive or negative), the evaluations would be one tool to make budget changes.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP11/9.1 Results-based management – proposal for Phase II

Decisions:

- Strongly supportive of CCAFS innovation in the CGIAR in progressing results based management
- Broadly support the proposition of indicators, with the following suggestions:
  - Increase the % assigned to indicators at both project and center level related to bilateral alignment to CCAFS
  - Join the two indicators on gender and social inclusion at centre level into a single indicator, with two separate criteria (finance + output)
  - Consider whether the indicator on CCAFS principles at project level requires further unpacking (especially in relation to bilateral budget)
  - Look at wording across whole set and ensure sufficient specificity to avoid ambiguities
  - Promote and seek feedback on the proposed principles and indicators with all affected parties to ensure sufficient buy-in

---

10. Internal Performance Management Indicators

Early in CCAFS we identified a set of indicators for helping us assess our performance, and these have been annually assessed since 2012. This agenda item covers two aspects: (a) the 2015 assessment (see background paper) and (b) the future of this tool.

2015 Assessment
Of the 11 indicators assessed, many were rated as good, but five got "could be better".

There is room for improvement on the number of outcomes reported. Of the 7 good/excellent outcomes reported, 57% came from core team members (as compared to Projects run from Centers), in spite of the bulk of the budget going to the latter Projects. The outcome-orientated culture in Projects is still developing.

There is also room for improvement on numbers of papers produced (# papers in CCAFS top journals; # papers published in ISI journals) and especially on number of papers published with a gender component.

Also rated as "could be better" was reporting because of the slow reporting of one Center. We will continue to put pressure on Centers to report in a timely manner because their slow reporting limits our ability to report accurately on time

Future Assessments

This is a useful exercise, but it probably needs to change to reduce management costs. Some of the indicators should be better aligned with the indicators used in the RBM system and those used by the Consortium.

> **Documents:**
> CCAFS ISP11/10.1 Performance Management Indicators
> **Decisions**:
> - To note the results of the internal management assessment and congratulate the team on the comprehensive set of indicators and its results.
> - To support CCAFS management team on the development and implementation of a new set of indicators to be put in place for Phase II (to be used for 2017) that better aligns with the emerging thinking in the System Office and is aligned with the RBM system.
> - To have a report in 2017 on the progress made in getting greater coverage of GSI research in journal articles.

11. Fund raising

At the 10th ISP meeting held by teleconference in May 2016, it was decided to add an agenda item on fundraising for the 11th ISP meeting. The purpose is to update ISP on CCAFS fundraising targets and approach in Phase II, consolidate feedback from the ISP and thus finalise the Phase II fundraising strategy.

The fundraising targets are quite tough, with expectations that program partners will raise ca. 200% of what they receive as W1/W2. A key role for the core team will be to engage with Centers related to opportunities and engage and provide guidance on mapping projects to CCAFS. CCAFS Contact Points have a responsibility to develop a strategic set of bilaterally-funded activities linked to CCAFS. Fund-raising will form part of the results-based management system.

> **Documents:**
> CCAFS ISP11/11.1 CCAFS Fundraising Strategy in Phase II
> CCAFS ISP11/11.2 CCAFS Fundraising Strategy in Phase II (presentation)
> **Decisions**:
> To agree to the fundraising strategy, including:
> - Focus on bilateral and W3
> - Approaching non-traditional donors (e.g. strong NARS, private sector)
> - Include fundraising in performance appraisal and results-based management
> - Raise capacity within CCAFS and ISP on fund raising
> - Focus on upside strategic opportunities for funds rather than business-as-usual with traditional donors
> - Enhance cooperation with CGIAR centres on fund raising for climate change research, including giving a whole-of-CGIAR picture of the climate change portfolio

12. Plan of Work and Budget

12.1 2015 year-end expenditure report
Some significant changes occurred during 2015 from the original POWB, especially the 32% cut in W1W2 (Slide 1). The W1W2 budget cuts made implementation difficult, posing the only real challenge to CCAFS in 2015.

W1W2 funds have shown significant change over the years (slide 2)

CCAFS' 2015 total budget was USD 66.064 million composed of: CGIAR W1W2 2015 funds of USD 33.720 million as per final revised Financing Plan; USD 32,101 of W3/bilateral sources from all CGIAR Participating Centres; and by a CGIAR W1W2 carry-over of USD 0.472 million (later cut by USD 0.230 million). (slide 3)

Total execution was USD 58.3 million (88.2%), 73% on Center-led projects (slide 3). Execution was 88% of budget after urging from CCAFS management to carry-over funds into 2016 because of budget cuts (slide 4).

Personnel continues to be the category with highest expenditure amount, with partnerships at 26% of total expenses (slide 5)

Of The Flagships, FP1 has the highest expenditure amount, followed by Flagship 4. Gender and social Inclusion research activities were USD 7.134 million, approximately 12.2% of the total annual execution (slide 6).

Overall, W3/bilateral contributions remain low (83% of W1W2) and on center projects this proportion is 103% of W1W2, with CIAT and Bioversity having high W3/bilateral (slide 7).

In previous years, the Internal Auditors queried some of the high amounts on indirect costs. In 2015 this was not an issue (slide 8).

Total W1W2 2015 funds were paid in two tranches, 35% ($11,873 million) in July and 65% ($21.847 million) by end of November. 28% of these funds were W2 (USD 9.405 million) and 72% W1 (USD 24.315 million).

12.2 2016 budget and financial update
CCAFS' 2016 budget as per POWB submission in January was USD 47,349 million, being almost 50%-50% between W1W2 funds (USD 23,700) and W3/Bilateral (USD 23,649). After the inclusion of the 2015 W1W2 carryover (USD 2,184 million) and a cut of New Zealand's W2 contribution (USD 770k), the adjusted amount of this funding source changed to USD 25,114 million, thus increasing the overall 2016 budget to USD 48,674.

The distribution of the total funds are 71% to Center-led projects, 10% Flagship Leaders, 10% Regional Program Leaders, 2% to the Gender & Social Inclusion Leader and the remaining 7% to Global Engagement and Management (slide 1).

As of July 31st, only 32% (USD 7,265 million) of the 2016 W1W2 budget have been disbursed to CCAFS. A second tranche has been confirmed by the CGIAR System Organization to be made before the end of 2016' third quarter (slide 2).

The consolidated expenditure report from all CCAFS Participating Centers as of June 30th arrived to USD 18,763 million of total expenses, representing only 38% of execution percentage against the updated POWB budget. W1W2 expenses added up to USD 9,373 million meaning that 63% of the W1W2 budget will be spent during the second half of the year. No center has informed CCAFS of any possible under-expenditure of W1W2 funds and all of them have been formally informed that there will not be carryover from 2017 (slide 3).

12.3 2017 Plan of work and budget

(a) Plan of Work

SP11/11.3 2017 presents the POWB. . A further version will be produced once the new format for it has been prepared by the System Organization.

As a program, we will give attention to:

- Reformulating regional impact pathways
- Setting up the Learning Platforms (LPs)
- Establishing a new relationship with Contact Points
- Building social capital
- Getting up to speed on youth strategy implementation
- Bringing on board a major new partner
- External reviews: CSVs
- Host first Independent Steering Committee meeting
- Hosting the first Partner Advisory Committee
- Results-based management
- Getting MARLO up and running
- Moving to Wageningen

The targets and milestones for each Flagship are set out in the POWB. Perhaps the single most challenge for Flagship Leaders will be establishing and implementing the new Learning Platforms.

The targets in each Flagship are essentially delivered by Projects in each of the regions. Regional Program Leaders have the task of ensuring that regional activities are strategically coherent and deliver on the outcome targets. As 2017 is the first year of implementation of the new set of targets, a significant challenge for regional program leaders will be communicating targets and the outcome-based approach to all participants in their regions. Proposed targets for each Region are shown in the POWB (Table 9). Another major challenge concerns reformulating the regional impact pathways, especially in regards as to how this interfaces with CGIAR site integration in each country.

(b) Budget

At this stage we assume the 2017 budget will be as outlined in the Phase II proposal. The 2017 budget presented on July 31st in the Phase II revised proposal adds up to USD 57 million (slide 1), 37% being W1W2 (USD 21 million) and 63% W3/Bilateral (USD 36 million). Given that the W1W2

expenditure in 2016 is probably going to be about 52% of total expenditure there will be a significant fund-raising challenge to reach 63%

Projects going forward in 2017 were selected based on considering impact pathways and past performance, but also considering that to be viable as a region a minimum portfolio of projects were needed in each region, and those projects should cut across the different Flagships. Several projects will be discontinued because of the overall budget cut to CCAFS, while several will be scaled back and combined with others. For the core team, the tendency was to give greater cuts to Flagship Leader budgets than Regional Program Leader budgets, given the focus on stakeholder engagement and fostering outcomes. Overall, Center and partner projects will be supported by USD 11,220 million of W1W2, most implemented as part of the regional programs. In total, the budget to be implemented by Regional Program Leaders is USD 3,865 million, while Flagship Leaders will be responsible for USD 2,805 million. There are two cross-cutting themes, one on Gender and Social Inclusion with a budget of USD 490k and one on Partnerships and Capacity for Scaling CSA with a budget of USD 1,940 million (some of this allocated from Regional Program Leaders to do cross-regional activities). The remaining amount of W1W2 funds USD of 1,940 million was allocated under the CRP Management & Support (slide 2).

The distribution of the 2017 total budget per the new Flagship structure presented in the revised proposal is 23% FP1, 37% FP2, 18% FP3, 17% FP4 and 5% the Management & Support (cross-cutting issues are included in this calculation under Flagship allocations). During the preparation of the POWB 2017, centers will be requested to update their promised W3 and Bilateral contributions in order to show a more realistic scenario than presented in the Full Proposal.

Personnel, Partnerships and Supplies and Services are the budget categories with the largest budget allocations in 2017 (Slide 3).

Slide 4 shows the budgets for a series of key activities, as per the requirements and definitions of the Phase II proposal. Of these, only gender has to be reported to the System Office. The amounts are indicative of the level of activity.

Slide 5 shows the breakdown of the budget to the Centers. It should be noted that the large budget under CIAT is related to CIAT doing the contracts for the large external partners (e.g. IRI).

Changes to the budget will be required before 2017, for example the negotiations with WUR settled on USD 700k more funds to WUR with the understanding that W2 allocations from the Netherlands would be double the initial expectations.

Documents:
CCAFS ISP11/12.1 2015 year-end expenditure report
CCAFS ISP11/12.2 2016 budget and financial update
CCAFS ISP11/12.3 2017 Plan of Work and Budget
CCAFS ISP11/12.4 2017 Budget
Decisions:
- To note the 2015 report on expenditure and the 2016 update
- To recommend that the CIAT Board approve the 2017 POWB

> - To disaggregate center budgets to show CCAFS flagship leader and regional program leader budgets, and major University partners;
> - To consider the opportunity to partner with other CRPs for future co-investment in the CCAFS learning platform
> - To consider external fundraising above current CGIAR caps, ensuring that this funding is also well aligned with CCAFS' strategy

13. Phase II ISC

The CCAFS governance model from Phase I, which has been favourably reviewed and which follows the recommendations of the IEA Review of CRP Governance, will be maintained with minor modifications.

The ISC has the following responsibilities: (1) Providing strategic direction to the CRP, including priority setting and the evaluation of results; (2) Approving the POWB developed by the Program Management Committee (PMC), and presenting it to the CIAT Board for final approval; (3) Overseeing external evaluations of CRP activities; (4) Maintaining awareness of stakeholder perspectives; (5) Serving as a programmatic report for the CRP Director; (6) Reporting annually to the Lead Centre Board (through the Board Chair); and (7) Serving as an expert resource to the PMC.

The Independent Steering Committee (ISC) is the overall advisory body, with CIAT Board taking final decisions on the Program of Work and Budget (POWB) in line with its fiduciary responsibility. The ISC will have: 7 independent members (with gender, geographical and disciplinary diversity, and mixed experience from academia, development agencies and the private sector) and 4 ex officio members, namely Lead Centre DG, CRP Director, Future Earth representative (representing non-CGIAR partners), and a DG representing CGIAR partners. It will meet twice per year.

The proposed changes from Phase I are as follows:
- The CIAT DG and not the CIAT Board member will be the ex officio member of the ISC. The CIAT Board has the right to send a Board member to a meeting as an observer if it so wishes.
- Centers will have a representative on the ISC. This will be a DG or his nominee.
- The Future Earth member is asked to represent the interests of all non-CGIAR strategic partners.

With the end of term of three ISP members and the transition to Phase II the ISP will discuss potential candidates for the new ISC, and present a list of potential members to the CIAT BoT.

> **Documents:**
> CCAFS ISP11/13.1 List of ISP members (confidential)
> **Decisions**:
> - To note the changes in governance going into Phase II
> - To request the Director and DG CIAT to invite Center DGs to nominate a DG from one of the Centers as a representative onto the ISC

- To ask the Director and Future Earth representative to work on the modalities of making representation of strategic partners a reality.
- To request ISP members and CCAFS management team to provide any additional suggestions for the draft list of potential ISC members for recommendation to CIAT BoT
- To recognize priority considerations for future ISC members, including strong private sector connections (potentially with a market- facing agri-business preference), Asia coverage, social and political science skills, and relevant experience in global and national policy processes (e.g. UNFCCC, NAPs, SDGs, Green growth strategies, LED).

14. Prioritization of items for upcoming meetings

The following topics, previously prioritized by the ISP or mentioned in this meeting, should be considered for inclusion at the 2017 meeting or later meetings:

- Capacity building and sustainability in local situations/settings
- Internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas
- Flagship 1 (from 2017 this is Flagship 2) 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
- Institutions and incentives for low emissions development
- Linking knowledge and action: status and outlook
- Progress in Flagship 2 (Flagship 4 in 2017) in getting synergies across CGIAR Centers
- Human resources capacity development framework for climate change, including curricula
- Role of ISP in W3/Bilateral fund raising
- Country targeting: how can it be improved in readiness for the 2018 region and country priority setting process.
- Beneficiary targeting: climate vulnerable, poorest of the poor, market-connected?
- Insights into Theory of Change thinking; lessons learnt.

Documents:
None
Decisions:
- To agree that future meetings should be structured around "science for impact" (c. three quarters of the time) and "managerial aspects" (c. quarter of the time)
- To agree that the following are likely priorities for the 2017 face-to-face meeting:
  - Flagship 1 and 3 science for impact (2 hours each)
  - At least one cross-cutting theme, e.g. related to science around business models, value chains and creative finance
  - Country targeting: how can it be improved in readiness for the 2018 region and country priority setting process
  - Beneficiary targeting: climate vulnerable, poorest of the poor, market-connected?
  - Insights into Theory of Change thinking: lessons learnt
  - Fund-raising strategy; lessons learnt and future strategy

15. Future meetings, dates and place

Due to budget constraints the ISP decided to have only one in-person meeting in 2015 and 2016. As CCAFS moves into Phase II in 2017, it has been decided that the new ISC will have one in-person meeting per year.

Discussions for meeting venues for 2017 included West Africa and South Asia.

Documents:
None
Decisions:
- To agree to have one in-person meeting in Sept-Oct 2017 in South Asia; and to have at least one videoconference (e.g. in April-May period)
- To request the CCAFS Coordination Unit to propose a date and send a doodle poll to ISP members
- To request management to plan and propose a seminar to be held in conjunction with the ISC meeting.

16. ISP self-assessment

The ISP self-assessment from the May ISP10 meeting shows overall good results, where ISP members rate performance as mostly good or very good. Only four ISP members completed the survey:

1. Please rate the IPS's performance against its responsibilities according to the ISP Terms of Reference

	Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
Ensuring independence of the programmatic directions of CCAFS and setting overall programmatic priorities				2	2	
Providing advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees regarding the annual business plan and budget allocations submitted by the Program Director			2	1	1	
Approving the activity plan and budget of each Program Participant				3	1	
Advise the Lead Centre on extraordinary actions when required, such as modification of a Program Participant Grant or termination of a Program Participant Agreement (PPA) if the Program Participant is				3	1	

in breach of its responsibilities.					

2. Please rate the ISP's overall effectiveness in fulfilling its responsibilities

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			1	3	

3. Please rate the relevance of the agenda for this ISP meeting

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			2	2	

4. Please rate the performance of the ISP Chair in running this ISP meeting

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
		1	1	2	

5. Please rate the ISP Chair's collaboration with the CIAT Board of Trustees and Director General

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
		2	1	1	

6. Please rate the performance of the Program Director and PMC in providing timely and relevant information for ISP decisions

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
				4	

7. Please rate the performance of the CIAT and Future Earth ex-officio members of the ISP in facilitating information exchange and programmatic alignment between CCAFS and their programs

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
		1	3		

Documents:
None
Proposed decisions:
To note the results of the self-assessment survey
To reiterate the importance of ISP members completing the self-assessment survey
To request the Director to revise the self-assessment form in light of the the Phase II roles of the ISC, to have the format available on survey monkey, and to have members fill the survey online at the close of ISC meetings

17. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

Documents:
None

List of documents

CCAFS ISP11/2.1.1 Agenda

CCAFS ISP11/2.1.2 Annotated Agenda

CCAFS ISP11/2.2.1 CCAFS ISP10 Minutes

CCAFS ISP11/2.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous ISP Meetings

CCAFS ISP11/2.2.3 List of Acronyms and abbreviations

CCAFS ISP11/2.3.1 CCAFS Annual Report to the CGIAR Consortium

CCAFS ISP 11 3.1 IEA Synthesis report final draft

CCAFS ISP11/4.1 CCAFS External evaluation Volume I_report

CCAFS ISP11/4.2 CCAFS External evalutation Volume II_annexes

CCAFS ISP11/4.3 CCAFS Management response to the external evaluation

CCAFS ISP11/5.1 CCAFS Phase II proposal

CCAFS ISP11/5.2 CCAFS Phase II proposal summary

CCAFS ISP11/6.1.1 Field trip concept note

CCAFS ISP11/6.1.2 Case study Daga Birame CSV

CCAFS ISP11/6.1.3 Field trip guide

CCAFS ISP11/6.2.1 The Climate-Smart Village Approach: A novel strategy for scaling up climate-smart agriculture options

CCAFS ISP1/ 6.2.2 The Climate-Smart Village Approach: An Integrative and Multi-Scale Strategy for Reducing the Vulnerability of Smallholder Farmers to Climatic Risks

CCAFS ISP11/6.3.1 Measuring gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R

CCAFS ISP11/6.3.2 Measuring gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R (presentation)

CCAFS ISP11/7.1 CCAFS Partnerships

CCAFS ISP11/8.1 CCAFS Risk catalogue 2016

CCAFS ISP11/9.1 Results-based management – proposal for Phase II

CCAFS ISP11/10.1 Performance Management Indicators

CCAFS ISP11/11.1 CCAFS Fundraising Strategy in Phase II

CCAFS ISP11/11.2 CCAFS Fundraising Strategy in Phase II (presentation)

CCAFS ISP11/12.1 2015 year-end expenditure report

CCAFS ISP11/12.2 2016 budget and financial update

CCAFS ISP11/12.3 2017 Plan of Work and Budget

CCAFS ISP11/12.4 2017 Budget

CCAFS ISP11/13.1 List of ISC members (confidential)