

## **Minutes of the 9th Program Planning and Management Committee Meeting held on 3-4 April 2014 at WorldFish Penang, Malaysia**

[www.livestockfish.cgiar.org](http://www.livestockfish.cgiar.org)

April 2014

CGIAR is a global partnership that unites organizations engaged in research for a food secure future. The CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish aims to increase the productivity of small-scale livestock and fish systems in sustainable ways, making meat, milk and fish more available and affordable across the developing world. The Program brings together four CGIAR Centers: the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with a mandate on livestock; WorldFish with a mandate on aquaculture; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which works on forages; and the International Center for Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), which works on small ruminants. <http://livestockfish.cgiar.org>

© 2014



This publication is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. Unless otherwise noted, you are free to copy, duplicate, or reproduce and distribute, display, or transmit any part of this publication or portions thereof without permission, and to make translations, adaptations, or other derivative works under the following conditions:



**ATTRIBUTION.** The work must be attributed, but not in any way that suggests endorsement by the publisher or the author(s).



**NON-COMMERCIAL.** This work may not be used for commercial purposes.



**SHARE ALIKE.** If this work is altered, transformed, or built upon, the resulting work must be distributed only under the same or similar license to this one.

[ilri.org](http://ilri.org)

*better lives through livestock*

ILRI is a member of the CGIAR Consortium

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100, Kenya  
Phone: +254 20 422 3000  
Fax: +254 20 422 3001  
Email: [ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org](mailto:ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org)

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Phone: +251 11 617 2000  
Fax: +251 11 617 2001  
Email: [ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org](mailto:ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org)

**PRESENT:**

<b>Committee Members In attendance</b>	3/4 am	3/4 pm	4/4 am	4/4 pm
Tom Randolph (TR), Program Director		√	√	√
Michael Peters (MP), CIAT	√	√	√	√
Jens Peter Tang Dalsgaard (JPTD), WorldFish	√	√	√	√
Malcolm Beveridge (MB), WorldFish	√	√	√	√
Shirley Tarawali (SAT), ILRI	√	√	√	√
John McIntire (JM), ILRI	√	√		
Stuart Worsley (SW), Head, Development Partnership	√	√	√	√
Martin van Weerdenburg (MvW), ILRI			√	√
<b>Observers in attendance</b>				
John Benzie (JB), WorldFish	√	√	√	√
Tan Ban Swee (TBS), WorldFish	√	√	√	√
<b>Absent with Apologies</b>				
Barbara Rischkowsky (BR), ICARDA	x	x	x	x
Pat Rainey (PR), Program Support Coordinator	x	x	x	x
Suzanne Bertrand (SB), ILRI	x	x	x	x
John McIntire (JM), ILRI			x	x

The morning of the first day of the meeting was undertaken in the absence of the Program Director whose arrival was delayed, and covered a review of the action points of the 8<sup>th</sup> PPMC and two agenda items: CCEE and Development Partnership Methods.

**Adoption of the Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the PPMC**

These had been previously formally approved and adopted by members via email. The action list was reviewed and the following items were arising.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
6	To include provision to document gender activities and associated funding in templates for activity planning	PR	Follow up with Pat
10	To include in the framework recommendations for learning (its scope, general methodology and organizational location), how any further benchmarking and baselining would be undertaken and how to take advantage of the data collection efforts of other CRPs.	Keith Child	Review MEL work being conducted in and by other CRPs
13	To submit concerns about the suitability of the environment indicator for aquaculture to Keith Child, JM and Michael Kidoido.	JPTD	More debate needed within WorldFish
16	To ensure that responsibility for <i>ex ante</i> modeling, including SAMs, is clarified between the Value Chain Development and Targeting Themes	TR	Needs to report on this with respect to how these are being incorporated into the program restructure.
18	To advise on participation of SDC in the CCEE and whether they should be approached to co-fund the	Malcolm Dickson	Remains outstanding

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
	evaluation.	(JPTD to follow up)	
21	To work with the consultant to improve the Value Chain Selection criteria report.	TR	Ongoing
25	To have SPAC review and approve final changes to the SPAC TOR (version 4).	TR	TR to confirm that SPAC approved this at the Morogoro meeting
31	To pursue business plans for the management and financing of crosscutting sectoral work	TR	Overtaken by restructuring
32	Centers to send Stuart their ideas and policy and related documents on per diem issue and SW to further develop the document for the next PPMC Meeting.	SW	Ongoing
37	To keep PPMC informed about progress with the ILRI proposal tracker system	PR	Update required
38	It was agreed that (1) Concept Notes be included in work plans; (2) one-day write-shops for concept note preparation to be appended to Theme planning meetings; and (3) an inventory of ideas for proposals be created and coordinated with partner center management.	PR	Concept ideas defined for flagships 1, 2 and 3 in the March planning meeting, but not for flagships 4 and 5.

**Action:** EN to post the minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> PPMC meeting on the Wiki and CRP website, with the list of action items.

## **1. Critical Success Factor 1: Addressing the Right Issues**

### **1.1 2013 Annual Report feedback**

Feedback from the Consortium Office on the Annual Report was positive. The report was positively endorsed for having a good balance between long term and short term research, for having a clear and convincing approach and strategy on gender mainstreaming, a partnership position that was strategic that provided interesting links to other CRPs, and for being open and reflective about risks and lessons learned. Its transparency was welcomed.

Issues for which attention is requested include more frequent and systematic use of web links for cited evidence. Mahider is being used for this by ILRI. Other centres do not have such a system. The PPMC considered the use of lab books as a means to cite evidence, but this is problematic for issues of confidentiality. Other requests included minor edits on the jargon used for ECF, better explanation as to how CRP will address value chain inefficiencies, and tightening up attribution on CRP links.

**Action:** PR will consolidate these and re-submit by April 11<sup>th</sup>

## **2014 POWB Feedback**

Feedback on the 2014 POWB has been received but not yet responded to. The PPMC asked TR to ensure that he communicates when we will respond to the CO.

**Action:** TR to ensure that communication is made to CO on the timing of the response

The work required is to tighten up deliverables, (much of this being achieved through the March planning meeting), restructure (a measure that is proposed to be pushed back for the extension proposal), and achieve the target gender budget of 10%.

**Action:** PR to consolidate the deliverables and submit by April 18<sup>th</sup>.

### **1.2 2014 POWB and Addressing the Gender Targets**

By budget, gender expenditure is currently at 5.4%. This was initially set as a 5% target but in 2012/13 rose to 7% and in mid-2013, rose again to 10%. The meeting agreed that the challenge now is to:

- Achieve the 10% target. The PPMC questioned the extent to which Livestock and Fish was being restricted on the ways in which gender work is calculated, and the extent to which guidelines are being too strictly applied. Internally, some investments in gender have been deemed as being invalid gender work. Part of the shortfall comes from not receiving a full response to the program's request for data from centers on budget use, and part perhaps from an overzealous application of the criteria.
- Assure that the 10% target is shared across all centres to reflect an equal commitment
- Assure that gender research claimed is bona fide gender research
- Address staff constraints: Kathy Colverson has resigned effective from July, and Alessandra is leaving on maternity leave later in the year.

To reach the 10% target will each year require an additional investment in 2014 of USD701,000 from ILRI, USD171,000 from CIAT, USD49,000 from ICARDA and USD258,000 from WorldFish.

A priority for this increased investment will be the genderised design and evaluation of technology. The supplemental disbursement of W1/2 CRP funds to the partner centres this year may not be adequate to cover this and existing budgets may require some internal reallocation.

The PPMC wondered if there were some sites that might lend themselves to increased gender work, and also questioned the extent to which the gender arena could and should cover broader social inequity, including youth, the elderly, and other stigmatized societal strata.

To address this, the program is exploring the possibility of an external group undertaking an assessment of work across the flagships, and to help with methodology on mainstreaming gender.

The PPMC also questioned the measures that should be in place to assure that gender investment is bona fide. It was proposed that

- The Gender Research Leader reviews all gender investments. PPMC members noted the need for a practical framework to guide assessment of gender investments

- Gender mainstreaming work is in compliance with CO guidelines

**Actions:**

TR will try and get intelligence about from other CRPs about capacity in external groups in conducting gender assessment.

2014, 2015 and 2016 Budgets will be crafted by all centres to respect gender focused allocations.

Gender group to come up with a mechanism and process for reviewing investments.

**1.2.1 Ensuring gender visibility**

There have been concerns expressed by the gender group that gender is becoming invisible in the new structure. TR proposed that a gender program should be established that is integrated within the flagships, but that this be separately reported on. This should cut across all work. The leader of this would be a member of the PPMC.

**Decision:** The PPMC endorsed this idea as a two way process to define gender linkages with technology platforms.

**1.2.2 Gender staffing constraints**

With Kathy Colverson's departure from ILRI and Livestock and Fish, there risks being a loss of momentum in the Gender team. TR proposed to conduct a staffing review across all centres, and to consider dual purpose functions (i.e. social scientists having gender as part of their job description) as a way to galvanise the right level of attention.

The PPMC noted that there has been little progress on gender program fundraising and wondered why this was so. In CRP 1.3 (AAS), WorldFish noted that gender activities were currently focused on explaining the Gender Transformative Approach (GTA) and developing theory here as opposed to fund raising. However, there are funding opportunities for gender work, and DFID and USAID were cited as being a significant source here.

ILRI similarly noted that donors welcome a gender focus. The program should better audit work being done, but availability of skills to do this are not adequate. In collaboration with other system CRPs, the program should explore hiring in consultants to do this in value chains. Such an assessment would be a good use of the larger external consultancy were this to happen.

**Action:** JM will use his database of projects to track Livestock and Fish bilateral projects and summarize the gender position.

**Action:** TR to explore options for the interim gender research leadership.

**1.2.3 Updating POWB 2014**

In December 2013, the POWB was submitted with a budget. With the advent of 2013 carryover, the POWB was enhanced to incorporate the additional budget plus the additional deliverables carried over from 2013.

With additional resources available, there is a need to once again revise the budget and offer additional deliverables. The PPMC was asked how this should be handled, and whether a new PPA was immediately required.

**Decision:** Centres indicated that although cashflow was not an issue, a revised PPA should be completed quickly, and make amendments in the future as required, e.g. when new funds are confirmed.

There is an issue with CIAT with respect to handling carryover budgets. For all centres except CIAT, the annual budget figure does not change through the year, i.e. expenditure is reported against the original POWB figures; the budget is not continuously updated to reflect additional monies received during the year. CIAT however revises its budget base every time there is an amendment, making reporting against budget targets difficult.

**Action:** MvW will connect with the new CIAT financial manager to seek a way ahead on this.

### **1.3 Update on Naivasha Planning Meetings**

#### Impressions

- The first two days were quite tough, but things became clearer as the days moved forward. There was buy-in to the new flagships.
- It was reported that some felt that forages were being sidelined
- On product lines, participants were a bit frustrated. Some people saw the advantages of naming what we are working around. We are proposing to keep the idea and see how it goes.

#### Leadership of Themes/Flagships

For the interim, it was agreed to explore options for leading the gender work until the end of the year.

PPMC members expressed concern that there were not enough people to cover all the bases for flagships 4 and 5, and wondered if it was appropriate to hire a new person. TR was mandated to take the necessary action to address this.

There is the possibility that in strategic partnership, WUR could assume some of these roles. They however have expressed concern with the number of unproductive meetings that the CRPs seem to require.

### **1.4 Update on the Extension Proposal**

April 25<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for this to be completed. TR proposed to aim for Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> for a first draft narrative as he will be on leave from 10<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> April.

The key adjustments required in the proposal were presented, namely

- Restructuring

- Shift from Themes to Flagship Projects, and from outputs to “clusters of activities”
- Opening up of partnership to Wageningen, SLU, and possibly development NGOs (SNV, CARE)
- Adoption of ‘product line’ and ‘discovery to delivery’ for more business-like management
- M&E based on ‘proving’ our Theory of Change by filling in the supporting evidence base
- Stronger gender mainstreaming
- More cross-CRP linkages, esp. where co-located

PPMC members suggested that we might also need to strengthen areas on environment, forages and possibly human nutrition.

**Action:** SW and PR engaged to assist in collating the first draft.

### **1.5 Update on M&E and IDOs**

There are some tensions becoming apparent in the CRP system surrounding the use of IDOs. These are being subject to internal reviews. The debate centres on the need to keep simple measurement of IDOs at the system level, and separating this from measurement of CRP research progress. While CRPs are happy to measure IDOs and SLOs, this was interpreted as being at the heart of performance monitoring M&E system for CRPs, and has given a great deal of attention to IDO indicators and targets.

This interpretation is being increasingly challenged. Livestock and Fish program continues to refine the IDO indicators and how they will be measured, while exploring the development of an internal research-based M&E system that would inform management in a more timely fashion, and be linked to the IDOs. There appears to be considerable interest and activity to define CRP M&E systems, and there is a consultant for the CO currently doing an inventory of the efforts to date across the CRPs that will help inform our initiative.

In the meantime, there has been a conversation with the CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) as to how to apply Theory of Change in value chains. However, this is more of a planning tool for prioritization that does not help to monitor and report on work.

If Livestock and Fish program could develop its own M&E system by the end of the year, it might be a pilot that could inform evolving best practice for the CG system.

The PPMC observed the need to be proactive here and assure accountability. Pulling back from measuring development impacts and negotiating with donors to focus on research outputs could raise a tautological situation that we would need to factor in.

A framework and a set of templates are needed that researchers can use to report their research progress, and that could be later used to link to IDOs in ways that clearly describe contribution. There is a risk that a series of M&E systems are imposed, so it is important to develop something that works for the program. There are experiences within partner centres and other CRPs that might help, including M&E work by AAS, A4NH and RTB. Collaboration and harmonization here would be desirable.



**Decision:** The program management should wait for a couple of weeks given that Sophie Alvarez of CIAT is working on an M&E system review. There is a need to actively pursue information on what is happening in terms of methodology development.

## 1.6 Update on IDO Indicators

JM provided an update of the definition of IDO indicators and setting of target values.

On IDO2 quality indicators, price is being used as a proxy for quality.

On IDO3 - income and employment indicators, it is proving very difficult to assess indicators in the face of technological change. If technology is equitable, then so too may be the likely effect. But we just don't know this.

On IDO4 – Reducing the nutrient gap, there may need to add an indicator for children. The PPMC felt that the correlation with maternal nutrition was assumptive.

**Action** JM agreed to provide information on General Algebraic Modeling System (GAMS) course and Trade-Off Analysis Model for Multidimensional Impact Assessment (TOA MD) training, and on the bio-economic models applied for computations of targets in livestock and fish value chains.

**Action** Michael Kidoido will be asked to reveal the basis for the calculations for the extrapolated gains in IDO projections over time.

## 1.7 Update on Consortium Commissioned External Evaluation (CCEE)

This evaluation has been structured in accordance with instructions from the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) office, and accordingly an evaluation reference group has been set up. ILRI board member Cheikh Ly has agreed to be part of this. The reference group will review the Terms of Reference and select the chair of the evaluation. Two additional team members will be selected following the appointment of the chair. Some suggestions for the team leader have been made and were listed.

**Decision** The PPMC felt that this list should be expanded to reflect a wider pool including Africans and women. Each PPMC member would reflect and try and come up with a few names for inclusion onto this list.

PPMC expressed concern at the process of compiling the team, and making VCCs aware of the process, and wondered if this would lead to slippage in terms of timing. Shirley Tarawali assured the meeting that this was not a real concern since the study was mainly desk based. It requires VCCs to send the right documents.

**Action:** TR will ensure that Keith informs everyone of what is going on and make sure documents are already being compiled

The four Value Chain Coordinators whose countries will be examined should be briefed on the evaluation questions to be asked. (Amos Omoro, Barbara Rischkowsky, Malcolm Dickson, Danilo Pezo). SAT will follow up with Keith Child to ensure that VCCs are on top

of this. This will entail Keith sending out a reminder to VCCs of documents required and deadlines for delivery.

## **1.8 Bangladesh and Burkina Faso business cases**

**Decision:** The updated Bangladesh business case was reviewed and approved.

Outstanding concerns remain on the Burkina Faso business case as follows:

- Old references and citations have been used where there are more recent ones available.
- There needs to be more documentation about ILRI's work in Burkina Faso as a context. Here, potential synergies need to be described.
- There are a lot of assumptive statements.
- The document focuses strongly on export markets and does not describe how the value chain would contribute to food security.
- The document does not make the case for small ruminants over and above other possibilities, and does not make the case for Burkina Faso as opposed to another country.
- The document does not spell out the 2014 POWB nor the longer-term plan, including staffing needs.

**Action** The PPMC members recommended that there be a wider ILRI convening to improve the paper.

## **2. Critical Success Factor 2: Building Effective Delivery Teams**

### **2.1 Update on strengthening Value Chain Coordinator role**

A gap analysis was undertaken between the actual and desired roles of Value Chain Coordinators. In summary, these were

- 1) Assuring local financial capability to initiate and attract action.
- 2) Assuring a stable team increases chance for success
- 3) Flagship work should preferentially engage VCs as field laboratories.
- 4) VCCs would benefit from the establishment of a forum
- 5) VCCs should be capable of conducting innovation systems research.

The PPMC noted that resources for field research do not always lie in value chain areas. Nevertheless, it is important to try and incentivize flagships to have activities in the value chains. The discussion held under CSF 5 – Update on Finance will offer approximately US\$ 40,000 per value chain to stimulate VC growth.

However, it was noted that not all VCCs fully understand their roles and this compromises their ability to invest. It was also noted that the use of National Coordinators is not always viable. The noted absence of innovation systems research skills might be assisted by some work that Ranjitha Puskur (WorldFish) is doing to scope potential partners. Some training in innovation systems research may be appropriate.

**Decision**      For the moment, PPMC determined that there should be no specific action. Rather we should wait and see how things evolve under the restructuring.

### **3. Critical Success Factor 3 - Influencing – selling the role of ASF and AR4D concepts**

No discussions had here.

## **4. Critical Success Factor 4 - Building Partnerships**

### **4.1 Development Partnership Strategy Methodology**

**Decision**      The PPMC endorsed the proposed methods, and asked for the following enhancements to be included.

- Clarification of the role of external formal and scientific knowledge on the action and learning platforms
- Descriptions on the process of how judgment is applied; in particular relating to go and no-go decisions
- Clear indicator reporting methods and approaches – basic tables that give a sense of progress
- The strategy should amalgamate development partnership ideas with research partnership strategy, make language more concise, to bundle the strategy with methodology, and define intentional strategic outcomes.
- Ways to assure the right skills to achieve this. These include skills in development facilitation, and innovation systems research.

#### **4.1.1 Development Partnerships Agreements**

An agreement was recently signed between SNV and ILRI on behalf of the CRP. There are issues that need to be resolved in signing such agreements for, as the legal basis for Livestock and Fish program, ILRI has interests beyond the program that such agreements would relate to. Similarly, CIAT have also proceeded to secure agreements on forage work with SNV in Kenya, and are also exploring a global MoU.

This presents a potential area for confusion in seeking to pursue the program's interest, where the Head of Development Partnerships is not involved in or aware of wider ILRI and Livestock and Fish program center interests.

TR expressed some concern that some development partners might have expectations regarding “preferred partnership”; this would need to be explored and clearly defined to avoid loss of trust going forward.

## **4.2 Update on Strategic Research Partnerships**

### **4.2.1 Wageningen UR**

Following a visit to discuss strategic research partnership with WUR in March, the following impressions were gathered from PPMC meeting members who had attended.

- There were not enough people from WUR to conduct an effective conversation around Value Chain research collaboration,
- WUR has strong aquaculture work around the efficiency of pond and fish production. This could lead to joint work on closing the yield gaps. WUR were very enthusiastic and sought to do a substantial piece of work with the program.
- Animal Health potential was seen as significant. Suzanne led discussions here and is reported to be positive.
- Martin Scholten, Managing Director Animal Sciences Group at WUR, and leading the process of partnership engagement was very positive and supportive. There was a strong endorsement from both parties/leaderships. There was good chemistry.
- Environment was discussed at a side-meeting. Most of WUR’s focus is on Europe, so would require political support to re-orient. This offers significant potential for a new alignment. A workshop is to be organized in May to brainstorm potential areas of work and define firm areas for action. From the side of Livestock and Fish program, this will be attended by BR, Iain Wright, MP, An Notenbaert, and one delegate from WorldFish.
- Feed and forage work focus mainly on temperate species. There is not much that WUR would bring. However, they are working with a fungus on lignin degradation and would be interested to test this within one of our value chains
- Innovation systems staff were not represented, so no discussions were had here.
- WUR have been working with HumidTropics and their experience so far is mixed. They complained of excessive meetings. They want to work with people, not talk with people.
- Gender studies at WUR are somewhat diffused.
- On Nutrition, there is some capacity within CDI that is linked to A4NH. A new area of collaboration needs to be developed here.

There is a strong sense of complementarity between the work of WUR and the program, without there being much overlap. WUR regard us as having the means to help them achieve impact.

**Decision**            **Overall, there was a strong endorsement from the PPMC on the viability and value of pursuing a strategic partnership with WUR. In working with them as core partners, we**

**need to define what it is that we can do and achieve as a result of the relationship, and why we cannot deliver the program without WUR.**

#### *4.2.1.1 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the WUR Partnership*

A SWOT analysis of the relationship was presented.

**Decision**        The analysis was accepted in principle with some amendments.

#### *4.2.1.2 Options for Strategic Research Partnership with WUR*

The meeting considered 2 options for partnership, namely a Full Partnership, where WUR are treated in the same way as CGIAR centre partners; or an Arm's Length Alliance, where engagement is managed through MoUs and Agreements.

Although full partnership was seen as desirable, there are risks involved. To manage these, any relationship should be governed by a probationary period. A full alliance should also come with respective assured financial stability.

**Decision**        The meeting approved to proceed towards full partnership, for this offers the best chance to secure full commitment.

**Action**        The meeting asked that TR find out WUR's strategic agenda in wanting to form such partnership. This should provide a sense of the level to which WUR would want to see the partnership reach. The next steps proposed were endorsed, namely

1. Confirm WUR intent after they have consulted internally
2. Develop agreements
3. Pursue 3-4 priority collaborations
4. Confirm proposed time line

**Action:** MP also agreed to ascertain the interest and viability of a similar relationship with another potential development partner: GiZ.

#### **4.2.2 Update on Strategic Research Partnerships - SLU**

The proposed strategic relationship with the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) encompasses their work at Uppsala, some associated research farms and stations, and the affiliated Aquaculture Centre North at Kålarne. The aquaculture centre focuses mainly on producing Arctic Charr.

**Decision**        There is considerable interest at SLU to form a strategic partnership. The strategic reasons for their interest are not known at the moment. A consultation visit is proposed for the week of June 9<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup>.

A number of participants were proposed.

The focus of exploration will be mainly around animal health, genetics and nutrition, though other areas (environmental impacts, value chain development, gender, nutrition) will certainly be explored.

## **5. Critical Success Factor 5 - Governance & Leadership**

### **5.1 Update on Finance**

One million dollars in W1 funding that had been pledged by the CO to enable the program to reach the \$12 million budget target for 2013 was withdrawn following the larger than expected Swedish W2 contribution to Livestock and Fish program. This was part of the CO's efforts to even financing between CRPs.

Livestock and Fish program is now working towards a \$16.1 million projected budget in 2014. The projection is for the continuation of approximately \$13 million from W2 over the coming 2 years. This puts the program in a solid financial position.

The PPMC expressed the need for a strategy to ensure that these funding lines remain open. It is important to find ways to keep key donors informed on what is being delivered for their investments. The relationship with WUR is one possible element of this, but it is as yet unclear how this helps. A similar tack could be taken with Australia. MvW expressed bigger concerns about USAID, and pointed to a conflict between the intentions of the Fund Council and those of the centres and CRPs. He felt that we should not hold back from engaging donors, and focus on securing W3 and bilateral funding.

Action: TR will prepare an Issue Brief on strategy options.

### **5.2 Use of Additional Money.**

TR provided an overview of the history behind an increase in budget availability for 2014. Right now, there is an additional US\$ 3 million available in 2014 given that there is now confidence to work at an annual level of US\$ 16.1 million. \$800,000 of this can be used to make good the management shortfall. The balance can be used for strategic investment, filling gaps and in initiating priority research.

#### **5.2.1 Gap Filling and Strategic Investments**

TR proposed a list of 9 priority uses for the US\$ 686,000 budget allocated to strategic investments (how the amount was determined is explained in the Issue Brief 9-4 *2014 Budget Supplement*). The meeting proposed to add strategic investment in gender and value chain research, profiling of the CRP, and assessment of environmental impact. The meeting agreed that opening new value chains in new countries should not be considered until the value chains in current countries are up and running (or concluded). (CIAT is keen to open a new fully funded chain in Colombia, and WorldFish will develop a business case for a fish value chain in Ghana.)

This gave rise to 12 priorities as follows;

Hi	Wageningen partnership start-up (coordinator, post-docs)	\$250k
	SLU partnership consultation	\$20k
	Convening on research-development partnership	\$30k
Hi	M&E system consultancy	\$80k
Hi	Convening on nutrition strategy	\$40k
	Innovation systems position (1/2 yr)	\$75k
	Policy analysis position (1/2 yr)	\$75k
	Value chain economics lead position (1/2 yr)	\$75k
	Value chain start-up in Bangladesh, Burkina Faso	\$200k
	Gender and value chain research,	
	Profiling the CRP	
	Assessment of environmental impact	

Of these 12 priorities offered, it was proposed to consider combining the funded position on policy and innovation systems. Further, any position filled should be dedicated and structured so as to work across the CRP, as opposed to being an aggregation of partial time commitments from existing talent. This is about hiring new talent, not about reallocating resources across existing staff.

**Decision**      The top three selections proposed by TR were approved by the meeting.

- Wageningen partnership start-up (coordinator, post-docs) at US\$ 250,000
- M&E system consultancy at US\$ 80,000
- Convening on nutrition strategy at US\$ 40,000

The balance of available resources i.e. US\$ 316,000, will be used in accordance with proposals offered in line with the remaining priorities defined above.

**Action**      PPMC members are invited to submit proposals over and above those presented. TR will offer guidelines and request specific proposals in “low hanging fruit”

### **5.2.2 Competitive Call**

An additional US\$ 686,000 was proposed to be used for competitive bids around priority thematic research areas. TR proposed that half should be used internally for cross centre activities, and half for bids for cross CRP work open to researchers from both the program and other CRPs.

The thematic area chosen could be value chain work in contextual adaptation of technologies for ownership and appropriateness.

**Decision**      The PPMC agreed that Value Chain Coordinators should have a greater say in using funds in order to attract flagships to work to deliver in VCs. Therefore each value chain will be invited to submit a proposal for a set amount. Poor proposals would not be funded, but this should not be seen as a competitive process. Rather, the spirit should be that all chains have an equal chance for a fair share. This would commit one half of the resources (US\$ 343,000 over a two year period).

For the balance of the resources (US\$ 343,000) a call for proposals will be made through a competitive bidding process. A time frame and criteria need to be developed for a call to be made in mid-May or mid-June

### 5.3 CRP Governance Review Recommendations

The CO has presented guidelines for CRP governance that imply that all CRPs must comply in the same way. However, the side messages being received indicate there might be some flexibility in how they are implemented.

The recommendations from the CRP governance review are for SPAC to be appointed by and report to the Board of Trustees of the leading centre. This strengthens their role and specifically gives them approval rights over the annual POWBs, and right of appointment of the CRP Director. The PPMC by contrast becomes more focused on implementation.

Two options were presented to the PPMC, namely to adapt completely, or to make minor adjustments to the current arrangement. The meeting felt that the arrangement that we currently had was working well, and felt that radical changes would be disruptive to currently good function.

**Decision**      The meeting moved to adopt option 2, to maintain the current arrangement and make minor adjustments. These include

- *Strengthen the link between the ILRI BoT and SPAC*
- *Strengthen the role and power of SPAC*
  - *Consideration needs to be given to the extent of additional functions SPAC would assume including POWB approval, and Annual Report Approval)*

**Action**      TR will take these messages to the ILRI BoT

### 5.4 SPAC

The PPMC reviewed the list of candidates to replace Jemimah Njuki on SPAC. Three were agreed as priorities.

**Action**      TR will approach these for their willingness, and will submit the list of three to SPAC.

Other upcoming tasks for SPAC are as follows

- Review of Extension proposal in April
- Review of Strategic Implementation Plans in August
- Review of the new Theory of Change
- Review of the Partnership Strategy and Methods paper

The next SPAC meeting will be proposed to be held in September in Nairobi around the Genetics flagship. The Development Partnership Strategy and Methods will be reviewed, as well as a succession strategy for SPAC members.



The December SPAC meeting will be held in Uganda.

The structure and format for SPAC engagement remains somewhat ad hoc. A framework for this should be defined.

### **Discussion on SPAC Membership**

The original members will have completed a term of 2 years by September. With the potential for WUR partnership in governance, there was concern that the roles of the WUR staff member might be compromised.

**Decision**        Criteria for SPAC membership renewal will be proposed for the agenda in the September SPAC meeting.

## **6. Any Other Business**

### **6.1 How do we describe our CRP model, and is it getting us the best results?**

The program was crafted collectively in such a way that centres could achieve their aims through the program. The Director has therefore been less directive, and has not sought to command business. Rather, he has assumed the role of challenging centre propositions for ideas to fit with the program's objectives. The message to centres has been "this is your CRP". Other CRPs have done this differently, where CRP management directs more and asks centres to respond. The discussion focused on whether the current modality was the right one to continue with.

The following points were made:

- There is direction, but the director is not micro managing. This is a good way to assure creative science.
- In other CRPs where there has been emphatic leadership, there have been multiple changing directions. Here, centralization of CRP decision making has not led to clearer direction. In this CRP, there has been stability. The proposals for the new governance structure are therefore worrying where it proposes greater centralization.
- The current structure has successfully organized around the enthusiasm of the centres, and has placed power in the same place as accountability. In this program, centralization is inappropriate.
- The model we have now is working well. This is reflected in the excellent way that we work together. We have been given the freedom to grow into the program, and this should not change.
- We must continue to reinforce shared vision and direction. This needs to be better embedded within the flagships. Within boundaries, we must maintain freedom to act.
- The proof of the concept will come in Phase 2. If there is a broader basis of consultation for this second proposal, there will be greater buy-in.
- We have not imposed Results Based Management. It is difficult to show that we are performing well. How can we measure performance? Does this current model allow for behaviour that is too lax?

- We must become stricter in setting goals and allocation targets if we are to deliver and continue. So far this has been left up to the centres.
- A lot of work remains to be done on the Theory of Change, putting numbers on this and fleshing this out in a dialogue with flagships. We have to learn and develop, but it is difficult to be clear about the indicators that we should use. In AAS, a bottom up approach is used. But once the agenda has been set through such bottom up approaches, a rigorous agenda is set. On this basis, contracts are issued, and those who do not deliver are cut off.

## **6.2 PPMC Dates**

The September 2014 PPMC will be held virtually. Logistics on how to meet effectively considering the time difference between Cali and Penang need to be worked out.

The December PPMC will be held in Uganda between 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2014.

## **6.3 Upcoming Conferences of Interest**

- World Aquaculture Society, June 7-11, 2014, Adelaide
- Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock. 5<sup>th</sup> Multi-Stakeholder Meeting; Oct 7-10, 2014, Cali
- International Grasslands Congress (IGC) November, 2015, India
- International Symposium on Integrated Crop-Livestock Systems (ICLS); end 2015

## **6.4 Gender IDO**

The PPMC will consider the proposal for a 7<sup>th</sup> IDO submitted shortly before this meeting at its next meeting.

## **6.5 Departure of Malcolm Beveridge**

This is the last PPMC meeting that Malcolm Beveridge will attend since he is retiring from his position at WorldFish. All PPMC members thanked him for his outstanding contributions to the Livestock and Fish program.