

CCAFS

2nd INDEPENDENT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

11 – 13 September, 2017

New Delhi, India

MINUTES

Participants: Brian Keating (Chair)
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)
Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza
Tim Payn (Future Earth) (*ex officio*)
Arona Diedhiou
Ruben Echeverria (*ex officio*)
Paul Desanker

Invited participants:

Program Management Committee

- Robert Zougmore
- Philip Thornton
- Sophia Huyer
- Lini Wollenberg (virtual)
- Ana Maria Loboguerrero

Other Flagship and Regional Leaders

- Pramod Aggarwal
- Dawit Solomon
- Jim Hansen
- Andy Jarvis

Other members of Program Management Unit

- Anette Engelund Friis
- Julian Rivera

Regret: Mercedes Bustamente

Monday, 11 September

09:00 – 14:00 Seminar: “Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security: *Perspectives from South Asia*”

This is a public seminar with partners (both CGIAR and external partners). The aim is to get the big picture on strategic directions for research and development in South Asia, with a focus on India, Nepal and Bangladesh. How to strengthen partnerships with the private sector will be discussed. Critical questions and comments as to proposed different strategies and key research issues are welcomed.

14:00 – 15:30 **Field visit to climate change facilities and national gene bank**

16:00 – 18:30 **Flagship projects in SA**

This is a more internal meeting of the major project implementing partners. The Regional Program Leader (RPL) will give an overview of the regional program, to be followed by very short presentations from most project leaders. These presentations will focus on new science in the projects and scaling out strategies for CSA. CCAFS PMC wishes to rethink the portfolio, so we welcome critical comments to project leaders on the current work and how they see it evolving. ISC members will be able to reflect on the morning seminar and this session, and provide further critical comments in the ISC meeting on Tuesday. See that agenda item for the emerging ideas about how the portfolio needs to evolve in Phase II.

1) Welcome by the Chair and announcements

The Chair opens the meeting and welcomes the participants. Anette Friis provides practical information about lunch, dinner, etc. The Chair calls for disclosure on any conflict of interest issues. Chair notes his work with ACIAR helping them to shape their strategy in East and Southern Africa. Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza notes her small consultancy with CCAFS in Southern Africa on whether public-private partnerships (as a means to scale up Climate-Smart Agriculture) are working for women. Paul Desanker noted his interest to engage CCAFS in helping enhance the National Adaptation Plans (NAPs).

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 ISC in the weeks after the 1st ISC 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 ISC2/2.2.2 Status and Follow-ups from Previous ISP and ISC Meetings).

The ISP requested a brief update on the CSV approach. Quite considerable progress has been made – the brochure describing the approach was updated and previously circulated to the ISC. A paper accepted in *Ecology and Society* is available in unrevised form. Protocols for consistent measuring of CSA outcomes across all the CSVs have been successfully piloted in Cauca, Colombia, and in the next months the trial moves to Ghana CSV site Meetings with all the agri-food CRP Directors have been facilitated, so that they contribute to the design and evaluation of farm level CSA technologies and practices. With the €2 million new funds from the Dutch science foundation (NWO), we believe the focus on inclusive business-led development and value chain approaches will be significantly increased.

At the last meeting the ISP discussed the external evaluation report by the IEA. CCAFS subsequently met to follow up on some 12 issues that the management team considered important to discuss. As reported above the CSV concept was thoroughly discussed, and work to understand trade-offs has been stepped up. We proposed to examine in more detail theory of change issues, and we now have a peer reviewed publication on that.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.1.1 Agenda

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.1.2 Annotated Agenda

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.1 CCAFS ISC1 Minutes

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous ISC Meetings

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.3 List of Acronyms and abbreviations

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.4 Paper on the CSV approach accepted in *Ecology and Society* (unrevised version)

Decisions:

- To adopt the agenda
- To adopt the minutes from ISC1
- To ask Anette to add status on action points and decisions from previous meetings

2.3 Updates from ex officio membersProgram Director

From the PMC perspective, the start of Phase II has been smooth. The Director will briefly describe the major differences between Phase I and Phase II. Given that CCAFS already made its significant changes in the extension of Phase I, we have not had to deal with any major changes in Phase II.

CCAFS notes the following opportunities for the ISC to engage with CCAFS core team and scientists in the coming months:

- 1) Global Green Growth Week 2017, Addis Ababa, 17-20 October 2017
CCAFS in collaboration with GGGI will host a side event on “Innovating agriculture for climate and food security in Africa” currently scheduled for 18 Oct at 09:30 – 13:00
- 2) UNFCCC COP23, Bonn, 6 - 17 November 2017
CCAFS has planned a few side events and meetings during COP23 and is planning to link the multiple side events and meetings into a single theme, which will have the effect of a day-long conference, but spread out over multiple days and events. The proposed theme is “*Agriculture Advantage: The case for climate action in agriculture*” and the list of planned events with expected dates and locations are as follow:

Agriculture Advantage: The case for climate action in agriculture				
Requested Date	Theme	Event	Venue	Partners / Speakers
7-Nov	Opening and context setting	A framework for agricultural development under climate change	Global Crop Trust Diversity office	TBD
8 / 9 /10 Nov	The Gender Advantage	Gender responsive adaptation in smallholder agriculture: Challenges and opportunities	EU Pavilion	CARE, IFAD, FTA, EC
9 / 10 Nov	The Land and Water Advantage	Is Sustainable Land and Water Management Compatible with Small-scale farming under climate change?	COP23 official side event	CIP, IWMI, RTB, WFO, AfDB
13 / 14 Nov	The Business Advantage	Scaling up private sector climate actions in agriculture	COP23 official side event	IFAD, WBCSD, SACAU, ICRAF, Uruguay, Kellogg Company
13/11 Nov	The Mitigation Advantage	Climate-contingent finance: Emerging instruments for mitigation in agriculture	COP23 official side event	CCAFS FP3, CIAT, ILRI

14-Nov	Closing and a call for action	Agriculture Advantage: The case for climate action in agriculture	DIE	GIZ, CTA, Syngenta Foundation, IFAD
--------	-------------------------------	---	-----	-------------------------------------

- 3) 3rd Annual CCAFS SEA Meeting (20-21 November) & CCAFS SEA & SA CSA Workshop (22-23 Nov) – location TBC (Bangkok/Manila/Hanoi)
- 4) 4th Global Science Conference on CSA – Johannesburg, 28-30 November
- 5) Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture (GACSA) Annual Forum, Rome, 12-14 December

Future Earth

New Executive Director, Governing Council and regional activities

Future Earth has appointed a new Executive Director, Dr. Amy Luers, (amy.luers@futureearth.org) to be based in the Montreal Office. Amy started on the 6th of September. Future Earth's five Global Hubs are based in Colorado, Montreal, Paris, Stockholm and Tokyo. Regional representations are operational in Asia, the Middle-East, North Africa, South Asia and Latin America & Caribbean, and Africa.

Following the annual meeting in Montreal in May this year the Governing Council has been carrying out a review of how Future Earth operates to set the course following the first two years of its operations. This review covers both governance and operational aspects of Future Earth and results are expected in coming months. A number of task groups from the Future Earth Community have been established and are contributing to the review. One task group has focused on Knowledge Action Networks, designed to focus on major issues in global change science and enhance collaboration and increase science impact within wider society.

Knowledge Action Networks

KAN information can be found here: <http://futureearth.org/knowledge-action-networks>. A number of KANs have CCAFS participation already and others may be of interest.

CCAFS is participating in establishing the KAN on the Food-Energy-Water nexus and has participated in the Paris planning meeting for this held in April 2017.

A 'Natural Assets' KAN is at an earlier stage of development and is likely to be of interest to CCAFS. Hannah Moesberger (Hannah.moesberger@futureearth.org) is the key contact for more information on this KAN.

The topic of decarbonisation, is also being developed for consideration as a KAN, and may also be of interest to CCAFS (contact Erik.Pihl@futureearth.org) as CCAFS has contributed some of their decarbonisation work to the Future Earth contribution to the SBSTA meeting of the UNFCCC.

Outreach

The Anthropocene Magazine has just produced its second edition on decoupling the economy with decarbonisation. We encourage institutional and private supporting membership. <http://www.anthropocenemagazine.org/>

Grants

A new fund 'PEGASuS – Biodiversity and Natural Assets' has been established with an annual cycle in June each year. More details here: <http://www.futureearth.org/news/request-proposals-pegasus-biodiversity-and-natural-assets>. The next round will be in 2018.

Upcoming conference

Planning for a major conference and associated transdisciplinary workshop in Durban in May 2018 is underway. Scope and content is under development contact Jon Padgham is the key contact: jon.padgham@futureearth.org

CIAT Board of Trustees (BoT)

The Director presented an in-person update to the CIAT Board meeting in Nairobi in May 2017, and the Board was very positive on progress made. CCAFS continues as a strong program and CIAT looks forward to its role as lead Center in Phase II. The next CIAT BoT meeting will be held in November in Cali. The CIAT BoT welcomes the opportunity to have the ISC Chair make a presentation at that meeting. CIAT now also co-leads the Big Data platform and looks forward to CCAFS making an effort to create synergies across the two initiatives. The CIAT Board approved the appointment of Dr Paul Desanker to the CCAFS ISC.

Documents:

None

Decisions:

- To note the updates
- To ask the MT to:
 - further explore what it means to be a global integrating CRP (GI-CRP), how this role relates to engagement with other CRPs, Centres and Centre alignment of climate change work with CCAFS
 - Identify what high performance in a GI-CRP role looks like and identify any current system wide impediments to achieving that performance
 - To communicate with other GI-CRPs and with SO, SMB and SC as appropriate to lift CGIAR wide understanding of these issues and opportunities
 - To add the GI-CRP role as a future ISC agenda item.

3) State of play of CCAFS, including 2016 report, and reflections on lessons learned

The 2016 technical and public reports will be briefly presented (see background documents: CCAFS ISC2/3.1 and CCAFS ISC2/3.2). Phase I ended on a high note with many significant achievements, as noted in these reports. As noted in the previous agenda item, no major changes have occurred from Phase I to Phase II, so no special transitional strategies have been needed. It is largely a case of improving on on-going implementation modalities and tailoring what can be done to the reduced budget.

Key developments since the short video meeting in Galway include the following:

- East African Regional Program leader now in place. This has seen an upsurge in activities and greater focus on Ethiopia, where the new office will be located.

- Budget for 2017 looks secure. W2 funds have risen from 44% of the total W1W2 budget in 2016 to a projected 56% in 2017, thanks to increases by Netherlands (+35%), Switzerland (+51%) and Australia (+266%). This does, however, mean that CCAFS still has a large W1 allocation of 44%. If the CGIAR system does not achieve its full income for 2017, then the % deficit at the system level will be applied to all W1 funds. However, so far the System Office is confident of achieving the overall target.
- Given the increase in funding from the Netherlands and the relocation of the office to Wageningen, there has been an upsurge of activities with Dutch partners.
- CCAFS is working with the System Office on a major funding drive for the CGIAR - food security under climate change (in the order of half a billion dollars). Apart from that CCAFS has scaled up donor-related activities as described in a later agenda item.
- Demand for CCAFS activities remains high, the challenge being to maintain depth and not be spread too thinly. For example, GIZ have requested CCAFS training for NDC (National Determined Commitments) implementation in Africa, and the GCF are asking CCAFS to analyse their portfolio in relation to gaps and activities that truly drive a paradigm shift. CCAFS also hopes to work closely with the UNFCCC on shaping National Adaptation Plans.
- CCAFS believes research synthesis and conceptual development can help shape development under climate change. In this regard CCAFS will have events with GCF and at COP23, a planned photofilm and document on best bet technologies (working with other CRPs).
- CONFIDENTIAL UNTIL ANNOUNCED OFFICIALLY: UNFCCC Momentum for Change award for the Colombia work of CCAFS conducted by CIAT, award to be presented in COP23 in November.
- There is plenty of exciting research recently published or shortly to appear, such as:
 - A special issue on "Gender Transformative Climate Smart Agriculture: Framework, Approaches and Technologies"
 - Herrero M, Thornton PK et al (2017). Farming and the geography of nutrient production for human consumption. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 1, 33-42.
 - FP4: The FP4 Leader lead a manuscript, "Climate Risk Management and Rural Poverty Reduction," that reviews recent evidence about the effectiveness of a set of technologies and a set of institutional interventions at reducing the impacts of climatic risk on rural poverty, and identifies complementarities that are expected to increase the effectiveness of climate risk management for poverty reduction in some contexts. It is part of an Agricultural Systems special issue, "Agricultural research for rural prosperity: Rethinking the pathways," initiated by the ISPC.
 - Wilkes A, Reisinger A, Wollenberg E, van Dijk S. 2017. Measurement, reporting and verification of livestock GHG emissions by developing countries in the UNFCCC: current practices and opportunities for improvement. CCAFS Report No. 16. Wageningen, Netherlands: CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). To be translated into Spanish and French. Publication expected in October.
 - De Pinto, A., Loboguerrero, A. M. et al (2017). Informing climate policy through institutional collaboration: reflections on the preparation of Colombia's nationally determined contribution. *Climate Policy*, 1-15.

CCAFS continues to draw lessons on progress, the latest effort being a focus on best practice to achieve development outcomes. The Director will present the framework/principles emerging that are being prepared for publication (see background document CCAFS ISC2/3.3).

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.1 [CCAFS Annual performance monitoring report 2016](#)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.2 [CCAFS Annual Report 2016: The power of partnerships](#)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.3 Figure from draft publication on principles to achieve development outcomes

Decisions:

- To note the CCAFS progress made in 2016 and to congratulate the team
- Given the newly-recruited RPL in East Africa, the ISC requests a focus on the East African strategy at the next ISC meeting

4) **Cross-cutting theme: Metrics**

Metrics and indicators for tracking progress in adaptation and mitigation has been a topic on CCAFS radar for a number of years. Initially CCAFS held a joint workshop with the Water, Land and Ecosystems CRP and the Forests, Tree and Agroforestry CRP where metrics for resilience were examined, and out of it a working paper was produced. More recently, there has been some considerable demand from donors, and the [GACSA Knowledge, Investment and Action Streams](#) to provide them with workable indicators at multiple scales to measure progress on CSA.

CCAFS has responded to this demand by producing a collation of indicators that different donor agencies, research organisations and programmes use to measure progress towards the three pillars of CSA. A total of 378 indicators were collated, and organized into a [CSA programming and Indicator tool](#) which, based on a set of guiding questions, helps a given project/programme to i) examine the extent in which it addresses each CSA pillar; ii) compare the scope and CSA intentionality among different project designs and iii) support the identification/selection of appropriate indicators to measure and track CSA outcomes.

The tool has been quite extensively adopted and used by USAID, and has been actively promoted through the [CCAFS-World Bank CSA Guide Portal](#) and the GACSA investment and Knowledge workstream.

CCAFS has also been supporting private sector actors and namely the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) Climate-Smart Agriculture Initiative. As the knowledge partner CCAFS is leading the [work on Improving Businesses' Ability to Trace, Measure and Monitor CSA progress](#). The focus is on identifying a set of outcome and process indicators to help companies to monitor and measure the progress of company level CSA efforts, as well as the progress towards global ambitions set out in the WBCSD CSA Action Plan.

CCAFS has also worked quite hard to align the indicators and metrics it uses in its own research towards a certain set of standard indicators. For example, many of the [economic CBA tools](#), monitoring in CSVs, [CSA compendium databases](#) and [CSA Country Profiles](#) now have consolidated the indicators and metrics they use, thus ensuring certain comparability, and leveraging of distinct research projects towards common knowledge generation.

However, there is a big gap between indicators that scientifically robustly capture the complex elements of adaptation and mitigation, and the readily measurable indicators which can get put into practice. For adaptation/resilience, stability in production, or at a pinch assets is readily measured, but more nuanced metrics which capture adaptive capacity of households are very costly and complex to put into practice.

For mitigation, emissions are mostly calculated using Tier I default factors for projects and in calculators. These calculations can be up to 10x off measured estimates and usually don't capture mitigation effects. There is a need for regional and updated Tier I emission factors. Some of this can be done through modelling, but more measurements are needed.

Hence, there is significant demand for work on indicators and metrics, but questions remain as to the role and reach of a programme like CCAFS to engage in this. Guidance is sought from the ISC on whether CCAFS is missing anything significant. Some open questions include: 1) Is it CCAFS role to maintain and update indicators on CSA (e.g. the programming tool), 2) Should CCAFS invest strategic research resources to test different indicators and develop a better science basis of CSA related indicators, or 3) What can CCAFS say about developing CSA science if the indicators to measure it are very costly and complex to implement in the field, and impractical for use in broader development agendas?

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 4.1 [CSA programming and Indicator tool](#)

Decisions:

- To note progress on CSA metrics.
- ISC suggests CCAFS;
 - Focus the indicator work on what is necessary to support progress towards CCAFS objectives and goals
 - Share insights on CSA metrics with other interested groups where this is feasible (financially or from a human resources perspective) but don't over-invest core resources in trying to be the universal provider of comprehensive metrics resources or services
 - Look for the "simplicity that is on the far side of complexity", and engage in action learning in this respect to meet CCAFS own in house metrics needs.
 - Link up with other frameworks for metrics and indicators (such as those associated with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's) where this is appropriate.

5) Science for impact

5.1 Flagship 1

The aim of Flagship 1, Priorities and Policies for CSA, is to assess how enabling policy environments and priority setting for targeted investment can support the scaling of interventions, contributing to food and nutritional security and poverty reduction under climate change. The objectives are as follows:

- improved priority setting, trade-off analyses, and foresight.
- improved understanding of effective enabling policy environments.
- more evidence as to how CSA at scale can contribute to food and nutrition security.

- effectively informed investment decisions for improved resilience in food systems.

Through time, the flagship has evolved from three separate but related sub-themes (from 2010 to 2014) to an integrated set of activities and projects that address four IDOs and five sub-IDOs of CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework. The flagship pre-proposal and proposal for CCAFS Phase II went through several iterations, based on the External Evaluation and comments from ISPC, other external reviewers and donors. The final version of the flagship proposal was rated "strong" by the ISPC and endorsed by donors.

The scope of the flagship has been modified going into Phase II, with more emphasis now being given to food security beyond the production component, and more emphasis on enabling policy environments for scaling CSA and other food security-related interventions. There are three clusters of activities: Ex-ante evaluation and priority setting for climate-smart options (a Learning Platform designed with linkages to the AFS CRPs), Food and nutrition futures under climate change, and Enabling policy environments for CSA.

The documents summarise the deliverables and outcomes achieved during Phase I and the Extension Phase. The project portfolio is undergoing adjustment, as several regional policy projects are finishing at the end of 2017. This process should be completed by the end of September, and will take into account ISC commentary on the portfolio.

ISC input is sought on several key issues, including: (1) how appropriately to balance strategic needs and opportunism, in the search for policy outcomes; (2) how to get CCAFS to the cutting edge of thinking and action around transformation in agriculture; (3) prioritising among the many competing areas of possible work under the Learning Platform with respect to ex ante work linked with the AFS CRPs; (4) some guidance on how much of a shift to make from informing policy (an area in which CCAFS has had good success in Phase I) to working on policy implementation and evaluation; (5) given budget cuts, is FP1 spread too thinly over some topics.

Documents:

- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.1 FP1 presentation
- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.2 Phase II proposal for Flagship 1
- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.3 Flagship 1 projects and links (Table showing portfolio of projects and links to project pages)
- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.4 Summary of FP4 deliverables 2010-2016
- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.5 Summary of FP4 outcomes 2012-2016
- CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.6 List of flagship-related science issues

Decisions:

- To acknowledge progress and endorse FP1's Phase II strategies for achieving outcomes
- To encourage FP1 to stay engaged with support for policy implementation where possible to enhance impact prospects, noting the funding for this should come from policy implementing partners and the effort needs to draw upon a broad base of CGIAR and non-CGIAR partner capabilities (not fall back to the FP1 Leader all the time).
- Request FP1 to pursue activities and funding in the arena of ex-ante impact assessment via linkages with appropriate AFS CRPs and key external partners with economics and systems modelling expertise.
- To support the proposition that further thought and analysis is given to what circumstances (social, economic and/or biophysical) might be conducive to agricultural transformation. This is likely to require new and existing linkages with key strategic partners

5.2 Flagship 3

The aim of Flagship Program 3 (FP3), Low Emissions Development, is to test the feasibility of reducing agricultural GHG emissions at large scales while ensuring food security in developing countries. By 2022, FP3 plans to reduce agricultural emissions in developing countries by 160 Mt CO₂e yr⁻¹ (4% relative to projected 2022 levels). FP3's objectives are to provide evidence and tools for:

- improved estimates of emissions from LED in smallholder farming;
- impacts of LED on emissions, food security and other outcomes and resulting priorities,
- conditions enabling LED at large scales among smallholder farmers and in major supply chains.

The primary beneficiaries of FP3 are smallholder farmers, but research will also benefit national LED programs through better emissions estimates, technical capacities to implement and monitor LED, and policy development. FP3 assumes that agricultural development will be the primary platform for scaling up LED. Climate finance and policies will help integrate LED into agricultural development policies and practices and shape LED pathways.

The Flagship has evolved since 2010 from mostly Center-driven projects to the Phase II portfolio, which addresses major global mitigation opportunities among pro-mitigation countries, contributing to five IDOs and five sub-IDOs of CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework. A 2014 external review of FP3 concluded it was too soon to make definitive statements about impact, but that the Flagship's impact was "moderate relative to the scale of the resources applied to the program."

ISC input is sought on several issues, including: (1) managing targets that are unrealistic; (2) how to achieve impact when few projects are actively on the ground pursuing mitigation; and (3) how CCAFS should address transformational technologies such as low emission cattle or biological nitrification inhibitor traits in cereals or pasture grasses.

The documents summarise the Phase II plans, current portfolio and the deliverables and outcomes achieved during Phase I and the Extension Phase.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.1 Flagship 3 Phase II proposal 2017-2022
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.2 FP3 Portfolio 2017-2018 projects and links
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.3 FP3 deliverables and outcomes 2010-2016
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.4 FP3 issues summary
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.5 FP3 presentation on science for impact

Decisions:

- To acknowledge progress and endorse FP3's strategy for achieving impact.
- FP3 should review its 2017-2022 mitigation targets in the light of the research results / synthesis studies to date. Such a review should;
 - Identify targets that provide a stretch but are still well supported by the evidence of prospects for LED implementation at scale in the near-term
 - Any revised target should be comprehensive (direct agricultural emissions and carbon sequestration)
 - Communicate the rationale for any target revision with appropriate CGIAR entities and seek guidance on how to reflect revisions in future evaluation.
- While FP3 may well engage in policy or institutional work that seeks to generate the necessary transformational mitigation pathways, ISC urges caution over direct investment of limited core resources in transformational technical options (such as ruminants that don't generate methane or cereals that biologically fix nitrogen as examples). Other groups are likely to be far better placed to take on such high risk and high resource-requiring efforts. FP3 should maintain a watching brief of such efforts and engage when and where they have a comparative advantage to offer.

5.3 Reflections on the South Asia portfolio based on the seminar and project meeting

The Regional Program Leader for South Asia will do a short presentation on the current regional strategy and how he sees it evolving. The following are some of the key issues being considered.

Good progress has been made in many areas. For example, scaling out CSA practices and technologies by the partners using the CSV approach; new science on crop insurance, and partnerships for its scaling; India's agroforestry policy, precision agronomy, food security monitoring in Nepal, and capacity building. Success at a scale is also likely to come in other research areas. CCAFS has produced about 80 journal publications on South Asia in the period 2014-2017, and the South Asia team has also contributed significantly to global papers. The W1 W2 budget has declined but this has been offset by an increase in bilateral funding by some Centers as well as RPL unit.

The External Evaluation also recognized the contribution of CCAFS in the region but suggested a shift from Punjab-Haryana to more rainfed areas in India, and a greater focus in Nepal and Bangladesh. CCAFS have started making these adjustments but will wait for the results of the regional prioritization exercise in 2018 for full implementation.

In terms of thematic focus, the PMC believes that there is too much business as usual in the Center projects, and some themes have been well-researched and now need to be phased out. Some key gaps include use of big data in climate information services and insurance, breeding strategies for climate risk management, weather and pest and diseases monitoring, adaptation-

mitigation synergies and trade-offs, and renewable energy systems as part of CSA. The new portfolio in phase 2 should probably increase the focus on:

- Use of big data in developing farmer-centric climate information services and insurance,
- New tools for effective and efficient weather-linked pest and diseases monitoring,
- Comprehensive analysis of adaptation-mitigation options and their scalability,
- South: south learnings

Documents

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.3.1 CCAFS Success stories from South Asia (*Forthcoming*)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.3.2 Regional CCAFS strategy

Decisions:

- ISC notes with satisfaction the progress made in the region and its strong science-led outcome focus. We very much value the private sector engagement in the region and strongly encourage to continue this.
- ISC understands the drivers of proposed shifts in focal regions in south Asia emerging from the IEA external evaluation in 2015. However ISC suggests any shifts are carefully considered and occur on an evolutionary basis that maintains a focus on:
 - What mix of activities most effectively support progress towards CCAFS goals
 - Retention and/or growth of high performing partnerships (funding and impact pathways) Specifically a shift away from India is not supported if it were to run contrary to these two principles. A shift towards higher levels of bilateral funding in India and W1/W2 funding in Nepal, Bangladesh and other countries may be appropriate however.
- ISC endorses the proposed shift from well-researched areas such as conservation agriculture and primary measurements to new opportunities of using data analytics and modelling for developing farmer-centric climate information services and insurance, scaling up CSA, breeding strategies, pest and diseases monitoring, and a comprehensive analysis of adaptation-mitigation options and their scalability.
- ISC also endorses the suggestion that PMC should develop a focused proposal on south:south cooperation that builds on CCAFS core activities. This could involve India-Africa linkages if a sound business case and partnerships could be developed.

6) CCAFS Science issues: Has climate change been over-emphasized?

Most assessments of climate change impacts on global crop yields project a decline even as early as for the 2020s. The losses are projected to increase with time, reaching up to 50 % by 2080s. Poor, mid-latitude tropical countries are considered more vulnerable. Our recent meta- analysis of

27,208 data points from a systematic review however, shows a relatively small and often negligible residual net impact of climate change, even up to 2080, once farmers own adaptations are considered. CCAFS also only found a small difference in climate change impacts among geographical regions, and between tropical and temperate regions. Interestingly, recent studies (post 2000) project relatively smaller impacts of climate change compared with studies done prior to 2000. A comparison of the projected climate change impacts for the 2020s at country level with recently measured national crop yields shows considerable overestimation of impacts, even after consideration of adaptation benefits. These discrepancies are due to uncertainties associated with the methodologies used, regional variations in adaptation options, and inadequate consideration of large yield gaps and technological growth in these countries.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 6.1 Draft paper: “Assessments of climate change impacts on global crop yields are exaggerated” by Pramod Aggarwal, Shalika Vyas, Philip Thornton, Bruce Campbell, and Martin Kropff

Decisions:

- ISC congratulates Pramod and the team for exploring the scientific evidence base in such a comprehensive and open manner.
- The team is encouraged to link with appropriate economics skills in food demand/supply and trade to strengthen those aspects of the work.
- The results on regional impacts and food production shortfalls could add value to other CCAFS activity, including decision making on regions and/or countries for future work.
- Most importantly, the communications messages need to be clearly developed and circulated. The ISC understands the main message of the work is that technological change has been inadequately included (generally ignored) in climate impacts studies. The paper does not allow for an assessment of whether or not climate impacts have or have not been over-estimated as technological change and climate change impact are confounded in the observed FAO dataset. If this interpretation is correct then the title of the paper needs to be carefully crafted to accurately reflect the science message.

7) Evaluations and Reviews: CCAFS climate data/tools review

(a) General matters

CCAFS is committed to having regular external evaluation to improve performance. The Phase II proposal required that CCAFS lay out a schedule of evaluations, with those proposed for 2017-2019 as follows, with “reviews” being managed by the Program Management Committee (PMC) and evaluations being more under the control of the ISC (in terms of selection of topics and consultants). The latter are so-called CCEEs (CRP-commissioned external evaluations).

Type	Topic	Flagship/Region	Status
Review (2017)	Synthesis of lessons learnt from CSVs as testing and learning platforms	FP2	On-going – to be presented to PMC in 2017
Review (2018)	FP4: Review of FP portfolio, geographic balance, emerging opportunities to scale	FP4	(To feed into the following evaluation)

Evaluation (2018)	FP4, Climate Services and Safety Nets	FP4	PMC suggests deferring to 2019
Review (2018)	Review of CCAFS data and tools: uptake and impact	CCAFS wide	Completed (to be presented to ISC)
Review (2019)	Integrative work of Integrating CRPs: integrating tools and mechanisms	CCAFS wide; with other Integrating CRPs	
Review (2019)	Review of the regional strategy and target countries – should the focus change?	CCAFS wide	PMC recommends being done in 2018
Evaluation (2019)	Functioning and effectiveness of Learning Platforms	CCAFS wide	

(b) CCAFS climate data/tools review

A review of CCAFS climate data and tools was carried out in 2014, which provided an overview on the geographic and thematic dimensions of CCAFS data usage: on where, by whom and for which purposes tools and information were used (outputs). However, that review did not provide any information as to how these data and tools may be influencing the behaviour of various user groups. Another review was completed in 2017 with the explicit aim of ascertaining if CCAFS climate data and tools are indeed contributing to outcomes (knowledge, attitude, skills changes, as well as behaviour and practice changes of different user groups, and to understand what types of outcomes are being influenced as well as how. The principal tool used for the review was outcome harvesting. The review revealed a great deal of information about how CCAFS climate data and tools are contributing to outcomes, and concluded with some useful recommendations. If less resource-intensive ways of applying outcome harvesting can be found, this can be a useful tool for expanding the scope of CCAFS’s impact assessment arsenal in the future.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 7.1 Evaluations and reviews
 CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 7.2 CCAFS Info Note June 2017_Assessing the influence of CCAFS climate data and tools (includes web links to Volumes 1-4 of the full report).

Decisions:

- To recommend that the 2018 evaluation of FP4 go ahead in 2019, but scaled back with the proposed review and evaluation rolled into a single evaluation with a budget of about USD 30,000. This will come back to the ISC in 2018 together with a plan for wider CG evaluations.
- ISC advised against an over-investment in “Review of the regional strategy and target countries – should the focus change?”. See agenda item 8 for details
- To note the comprehensive nature of the data/tools review report, and the contribution of CCAFS climate data and tools to outcomes, and their very wide reach. ISC congratulates the consultants involved in the data/tools review on what they considered an in-depth review of a relatively novel topic.

8) Country and portfolio targeting: how can it be improved in readiness for the region and country priority setting process

Recommendation 4 of the External Evaluation of CCAFS in 2016 was that CCAFS should conduct a geographic prioritization of its activities as it moves into Phase II, in relation to “... its comparative advantage compared with the strength of national partners, the prospects for influence and impact, and the national demand for CCAFS’ institutional, policy and technological interventions.” Similarly, in the 2015 ISP meeting, the recommendation was made “... to support continuing with the current regions into Phase II, but requesting a phasing plan from regions or countries where there has been much success to new regions and countries, with the expectation that these shifts start to be made from 2019.”

The Phase II proposal already included some adjustments, such as an expansion of work in Nepal and Bangladesh in South Asia, and reduced work in Laos, Cambodia, Philippines and Indonesia in SE Asia.

A quantitative re-prioritisation exercise is proposed in 2018, using similar methods to those used in Phase I, based on qualitative and quantitative information as well as stakeholder input. This re-prioritisation process was discussed and agreed upon by the ISP in 2015. The realities of a higher proportion of bilateral funding in Phase II is likely to mean continued engagement in some countries that are not top tier priorities, although they would only be included through bilateral funding. Other issues to consider include current investments and the investment that would be needed to start in new regions, as well as the value of long-term engagement and guarding against the danger of becoming too thinly spread.

The proposed process for rethinking regional and country shifts could follow a similar process to that used to select two additional CCAFS regions in 2011:

1. Agreement on the selection criteria to be used, and the list of potential target regions and countries, and the proposed process (PMC, ISC; February 2018).
2. Data collation and any analysis to be completed (PMC and partners; by April 2018).
3. Stakeholder interactions, possibly including an on-line survey circulated to CCAFS contact points and key global partners (PMC, ISC, CPs, partners; May 2018).
4. Analysis and recommendations written up and circulated to partners for final feedback for proposing to ISC4 (September 2018).

The CCAFS region selection processes, together with the criteria used, are reported in “Initial Sites in the CCAFS Regions: Eastern Africa, West Africa and Indo-Gangetic Plains”, CCAFS, 2011, http://ccafs.cgiar.org/sites/default/files/assets/docs/ccafs_siteportfolio_v2.pdf; “Future selection of additional CCAFS target regions”, CCAFS, 2011, <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/67898>; “Additional CCAFS Target Regions: Recommendations to the ISP”, CCAFS, 2011, <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/42105>. Region selection made use of a range of material, including “Mapping hotspots of climate change and food insecurity in the global tropics”, CCAFS Report no.5, 2011, <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/3826>. Parts of this could be updated fairly rapidly with CMIP5 climate model data. In addition, there are several “hotspot” and data-related papers published in recent years that could be used to assist in region and country selection, including the following:

- Herrero et al., 2013. Global livestock systems: biomass use, production, feed efficiencies and greenhouse gas emissions. PNAS 110 (52), 20888-20893.
- Frelat et al., 2016. Drivers of household food availability in sub-Saharan Africa based on big data from small farms. PNAS 113(2), 458-463.

- Roman-Cuesta et al., 2016. Hotspots of gross emissions from the land use sector: patterns, uncertainties, and leading emission sources for the period 2000–2005 in the tropics. *Biogeosciences*, 13(14), 4253-4269.
- Herrero et al., 2017, Farming and the geography of nutrient production for human consumption. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 1, 33-42.
- Medek et al., 2017. Estimated effects of future atmospheric CO₂ concentrations on protein intake and the risk of protein deficiency by country and region. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 125(8), 087002-1-8.
- Smith et al., 2017. Potential rise in iron deficiency due to future anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions. *GeoHealth*, 1-10.

In addition, through partners at the University of Aberdeen, FAO, IIASA and PBL Netherlands, CCAFS has access to spatialized IPCC emissions data and mitigation costs, and to comprehensive integrated assessment model outputs showing the effects of alternative emission reduction scenarios and their costs and implications for food security.

Assuming current regions are maintained, the following is being considered by the Regional Program Leaders, although at this stage these are not reflective of any formal process:

a) For West Africa:

- No major shifts in countries are envisaged if the West African region is maintained at similar budget levels
- The AR4D CSV work in countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Niger and Senegal) will be pursued with an emphasis on analyses of trade-offs, cost-benefits and adoptions of CSA options, thus the strong M&E focus. At regional level, CCAFS will continue collaborating with ECOWAS Agriculture Directorate to dynamize the WA CSA alliance.
- The design, proper dissemination and effective use of climate information and advisory services for climate risk management will be continue with a higher profile for early warning systems and insurance schemes (Senegal).
- The national science policy dialogue platforms from Ghana, Mali and Senegal will be focusing on the use of evidenced-based information for national policy enacting. Towards their empowerment, they will be focusing on the development of national projects in line with the country's NDCs. Also the food and nutrition security futures under climate change will be given particular attention.

b) For East Africa:

- Given what has been accomplished in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda during Phase I and the Extension Phase of CCAFS, the focus on Ethiopia is to be increased, largely driven by stakeholder goals and priorities as well as identified bottlenecks and gaps. The country will become a focus for national policy research, and bilateral resources are being sought for research on the large-scale social protection program providing food and financial support to resource-poor households in exchange for integrated watershed management. Research will focus on how actions can be climate-smart and the institutional processes to achieve the actions. These are collaborative efforts involving CCAFS, other CG Centers and different Ethiopian Federal government institutions.

- An increased focus on food and nutrition, involving policy work in the region with extended coverage to include Rwanda and increased efforts in Uganda and Ethiopia to stimulate adoption of nutrition-sensitive climate smart agriculture, based on a diagnosis of key institutions, system linkages and coordination, and technical and institutional capacity gaps.
- The meteorology of the region is not that well understood, and multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional collaboration is being set up to build on improving the predictability of rainfall particularly in the Horn of Africa) to feed into regional initiatives to improve agricultural productivity, climate risk management and livelihoods. This will include research on improved index insurance products to build farmers' confidence to invest in agriculture, horticulture and the livestock sector, as well as to insure their infrastructure and input investments around agricultural produce and value chains.

c) For South Asia:

- Focus on Nepal and Bangladesh will increase, especially drought and flood prone areas. In India also, CCAFS will increase work in such regions in line with the recommendations of the CCAFS external evaluation. CCAFS will also reduce work in Punjab/Haryana where sufficient experience is now available. If budget permits CCAFS will initiate some CSA related work in other SA countries.
- The portfolio is likely to evolve because CCAFS plans to increase focus on new science and evidence base for supporting national systems to increase resilience of agricultural systems. We shall be seeking effective partnerships with NARS, civil society and industry for creating improved field evidence for our impact pathways, capacity strengthening of women, youth and marginalized populations, and also to facilitate south-south cooperation.

d) For Southeast Asia:

- CCAFS will continue with our focus countries (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, Philippines, Indonesia) taking into account the external panel review recommendation to focus more on Vietnam as an impact area. CCAFS will also take into account the focus on food security and nutrition, supporting NDC implementation, and CSA upscaling/investment. CCAFS's SEA portfolio is expected to refocus towards a more outcome oriented portfolio relative to some of the projects focus in the last two years.
- CCAFS will support the increasing efforts of the Centers/Partners to focus on climate change in their activities with NARS and fund raising efforts in the region to attain greater outcomes in the region. CCAFS notes the growing investment of NARS on climate change in the region especially efforts to access GCF and other funding sources.

e) For Latin America:

- There will be a major shift to work on food and nutrition security issues in Central American countries (especially Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua) in order to respond to government and partners' demands as this is a prioritized topic in the regional agenda. Also CCAFS LAM would like to take advantage of this opportunity to provide inputs in an area in which CCAFS wants to focus in its second phase.
- Considering the information stated in the NDCs, the potential for mitigation in some of the countries of LAM is much related to agricultural impacts on landscapes, especially deforestation. Therefore CCAFS LAM would like to give more emphasis on studying the

synergies and complementarities regarding agroforestry, agriculture mitigation potential and non-expansion of agricultural frontier through close work with FTA.

- Peru will no longer be a prioritized country for CCAFS LAM. This decision considered CCAFS external evaluation comments in relation to decreasing comparative advantages in this country. In general we consider that CCAFS can have more impact in Central America where national capacities are weaker.
- Colombia will continue to be a priority country for CCAFS LAM given the solid partnerships already established, the potential to work on mitigation issues, the opportunity to influence its Green Growth Long-Term Strategy and the fruitful work in Colombia's CSV in terms of influencing planning processes. Colombia can continue generating the kind of evidence useful to start similar processes in Central American countries, and therefore can contribute to scaling CSA in the region.

The more complicated decisions relate to a possible shift in regions. Centers have suggested three other regions as possibilities: southern Africa, the Middle East, and Central Africa. Southern Africa may be a high priority because of severe adaptation challenges. The Middle East is also a climate change hotspot, although the substantial governance challenges and the climatic challenges in the region probably limit agricultural development opportunities. Central Africa could be prioritised largely from a mitigation perspective, as it could be the next frontier of deforestation. Any expansion into any of these regions would require a reduction elsewhere due to the constraints in W1/W2 funding. Reduced activities might be considered in higher-income countries such as India, Colombia and Vietnam (possibly offset via new bilateral funding). However, for transformational mitigation options, some activities in those countries may remain as important.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 8.1 Country and portfolio targeting

Decisions:

- A rigorous process was used to arrive at the current regions and the ISC does not recommend a heavy process of re-prioritization at this time given changed circumstances including, but not limited to the much higher extent of W2/W3 and bilateral drivers of project activity . However, ISC supports evolution of the geographical focus in response to high-impact opportunities.
- Prioritization should be driven by the principle of maximizing the impact of CCAFS, and not focus only on geography as potential impact depends on several big drivers, e.g. donors, policy, partners, institutional opportunities, scientific opportunities etc.
- ISC is concerned about signs of very limited flexibility in the portfolio to respond to new high-impact opportunities and asks the PMC to consider setting up some form of internal market mechanism and a contingency fund to help support any regional shifts in the portfolio that required "seed investment" a year or two ahead of external (W2 or W3/bilateral) funds becoming available. This issue of financial flexibility will arise again in the item below on the 2018 POWB.
- ISC notes an extensive list of within region evolutions in the geographic foot-print of CCAFS, based on the insights of regional program leaders. ISC sees action on such matters as an issue for PMC but notes that all shifts should keep a strong focus on the achievement of CCAFS impact goals and not be driven by ideological drivers that could end up misaligned with these goals (e.g. mitigation at scale is going to require continued engagement with emerging economies such as India and Brazil)
- ISC requests an update on issues of geographic focus and responsiveness to new opportunities at ISC3

9) Insights into Theory of Change thinking: lessons learnt

CCAFS started using explicit theory-of-change approaches in 2013 in relation to a portfolio of new projects under Flagship 4 (now Flagship 1). A great deal of work was undertaken to implement the approach, and many of the insights and learnings are being used for a results-based management approach based on ToC and impact pathways at the CGIAR System level, linked to the CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework. CCAFS remains at the forefront of this work, including the development and maintenance of an on-line planning and reporting tool that is now being adopted by 8 CRPs and 2 of the CGIAR platforms, as well as by the System Management Office. Some of the key lessons learned from this long process are presented.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.1 Responding to global change. A theory of change approach to making agricultural research for development outcome-based, Agricultural Systems 152

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.2 Updated list of publications documenting CCAFS work around theory of change

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.3 Insights into Theory of Change thinking

Decisions:

- To note the progress made by the CCAFS team in implementing a ToC approach and in leading the CGIAR system by example and action. In particular to congratulate Philip on the publication and for his leadership in this important area.
- To support CCAFS in taking a highly pragmatic approach to ToC, rather than an overly academic one, to help generate evidence as to its efficacy compared with other approaches to focusing agricultural research for development. To take these lessons to the wider CGIAR and where relevant and possibly the wider development world (e.g. ODA agencies) as appropriate.

10) Fund-raising strategy; lessons learnt and future strategy

At the ISC virtual meeting in April this year it was decided to add an agenda item on fund raising at this meeting. The CCAFS fund raising strategy has been updated to reflect decisions made by the ISP at its meeting in Senegal in September 2016. The ISP decided that:

- 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 ISC on fund raising
- Focus on upside strategic opportunities for funds rather than business-as-usual with traditional donors
- Enhance cooperation with CGIAR Centers on fund raising for climate change research, including giving a whole-of-CGIAR picture of the climate change portfolio

To further develop the fund raising strategy in light of an ever changing and still more competitive funding environment, the ISC is asked to discuss the following questions:

- What types of donors should we focus on?
- More pressure on Centers?

- Should we revise the targets?
- CCAFS Core Team to increase time commitment?
- Full time person committed to fund raising?

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 10.1 CCAFS fund raising strategy

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 10.2 CCAFS fund raising strategy; lessons learnt and future strategy (presentation)

Decisions:

Agree the fundraising priorities, including:

Maintain strong internal encouragement for fund raising

RPLs, FPLs, Centers (Regional and Flagship Leaders to ensure the small amounts of W1W2 leverage bilateral funds to the extent possible)

Encourage and support partners fund raising efforts. ISC suggests the Director contacts Centres falling below expectations on W3 and bilaterals exploring how CCAFS can strengthen joint fund raising efforts with Centres.

Cultivating W2 donors and ensure CCAFS activity is addressing their priority regions and issues to the extent possible

New sources:

- Over the next 18 months look across the non-ODA sector and find prospective targets and find sources of expertise within or outside the CCAFS team, to foster non-traditional fund raising.
- Develop and implement strategies that target most prospective non-ODA sector actors

Undertake a stocktake of CCAFS distributed fund raising activity and consider whether sufficient resources are being directed at this issue. Identify any actions that could better support the core team and RPLs/FPLs in this activity. For instance would there be any value is a new position directed fully at fund raising or alternatively could a position be scoped that picks up some of the roles formerly performed by Sonya V and includes a component of high level fund raising? How would such a position be funded ?

Revisit the fund raising issue at the virtual ISC meeting in 2018

11) CCAFS Risk Catalogue

The CCAFS management team reviewed the risk catalogue in May 2017. The risks remain as in 2016, with very minor adjustments of low impact risks (e.g. under-expenditure likely in early parts of Phase II due to uncertainty and allowed carry over). The top four risks are as follows:

- Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS
- Funding stability from year to year and going into Phase 2
- Loss and erosion of funding increases uncertainty and reduces partner trust and critical mass of research to have impact. Decrease in funds to FLs and RPLs means loss of critical synthesis and cross cutting work. CRP loses leverage to align Centers' research to program.
- 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 in Phase II.

Three of the above are related to funding. CCAFS management added a new risk to the top category in 2016, namely loss and erosion of funding which increases uncertainty and reduces

partner trust and critical mass of research to have impact. The decrease in funds to core team means loss of critical synthesis and cross cutting work. Loss of funding also means CCAFS loses leverage to align Centers' research to the program. Major efforts have been placed on fund-raising, as discussed elsewhere at this meeting.

One risk is more thematic: "Weak commitment and/or capacity of CGIAR Centers to deliver a cohesive body of CGIAR Climate Change science.....". This risk relates to how CCAFS handles its role as an Integrating CRP. Management has met on this several times to discuss this, and it was suggested that this be a topic at the next ISC meeting where we reflect on the lessons learnt from implementation.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 11.1 CCAFS Risk Management Catalogue 2017

Decisions:

- To note the updated risk catalogue
- To reiterate the importance of fund raising
- To recommend that the ISC examines how CCAFS is doing on being an integrating CRP at the next meeting of the ISC

12) Plan of Work and Budget

12.1 2016 year-end expenditure report

The 2016 budget was planned with USD 23.7M of W1W2 funds plus a Carryover of USD 2,2M together with the promised W3/Bilateral contributions from Program Participants of USD 40.4M for a Total Budget of USD 66.3M. Close to the end of the year, USD 2.35M were disbursed as additional W1W2 funding and such funds were kept unplanned as a guarantee for the funding of the first year (2017) of CCAFS Phase II.

In terms of expenses, the total amount was USD 51.1M, with 26.3M of W1W2 and USD 24.8M of W3/Bilateral. The W3/Bilateral was well below the target. The W1W2 to W3/Bilateral expenditure ratio was only 0.94. The analysis of this ratio per program participant shows a concerning scenario as only 3 out of 15 CGIAR Centres were able to reach the target.

In terms of expenses by categories (Personnel, Partnerships, etc.) the result of year 2016 is not very different from previous years. Partnerships and Personnel costs continue to be the largest categories, 28% and 31% of the total expenses respectively. For W1W2 funds, there are no problematic findings as only USD 15k was used for capital equipment (IT equipment mostly) and the overall overhead rate applied to W1W2 was 13%, which represents a reduction compared to year 2015 (15%).

Expenditures by Flagship shows that FP1 (now FP2 in Phase II) continues to be the largest flagship (35% of total expenses) followed by FP3 (23%). Flagships 2 and 4 were at the same level (17%). The rest of expenses were reported as the CRP PMU Costs (8%).

Level of Gender expenses decreased from 13% in year 2015 to 10%.

12.2 2017 budget and financial update

As presented in the previous ISC Virtual meeting, CCAFS' 2017 Budget as per POWB is USD 57.6M in Total, composed by 36% of W1W2 funds (20.8M) and 64% W3/Bilateral funds (36.8M). The ratio of W1W2 to W3/Bilateral funds is 1.7 very promising, as in the past it has never surpassed 1.0.

Confirmed contributions of W2 per donor show that year 2017 will be the first year of CCAFS with 56% of total W1W2 funds from this funding source. W1 (44%) is likely to be secured since 1.82M of carryover from 2016 are included in such 44%.

Most of PPAs from CCAFS Phase II have been signed and the first instalment of W1W2 funds from CIAT to program participants will take place during the first two weeks of September where USD 8.6M (42% of the total W1W2 2017 budget) will be disbursed.

The current distribution of W1W2 funds shows that 54% is allocated under Program Participants (15 CGIAR centers, CARE, IRI, IIRR, UU and WUR), 12% under FP Leaders, 19% Regional Program Leaders and the difference of 16% under PMU and Cross Cutting Leaders (Gender-Sophia, Comms and Core Partnerships-Dhanush).

From the regional perspective, South Asia, East Africa and West Africa have the largest share of the total budget thanks to the W3/Bilateral estimated amounts from Program Participants. From the flagship perspective, FP2 and FP3 continue to be the flagships with the largest budget allocations.

Estimated Gender funds for year 2017 add up to 13% which is 3% above last year but still below the target of 15%. The region with the highest estimated percentage is South Asia and FP1.

Estimated allocation of funds per budget category shows that only 26% is under Partnerships, 4% below 2016 Partnership Expenses. Personnel has increased 4% to 32% and the rest of categories are at the same percentage.

As a final point regarding the 2017 Budget, the entire structure of CCAFS is in projects, most of these projects initiated in CCAFS Phase I. Regarding these projects, 14% (USD 1.55M) will close in 2017, meaning that these funds will be allocated to new projects for year 2018. For year 2019 the amount to be re-allocated is 57% (USD 6.3M).

With respect to the first six months of this year, program participants reported a total budget execution of USD 19.8M, composed by USD 6.7M of W1W2 funds and USD 13.1M of W3/Bilateral funds which represent i) 32% and 36% of budget execution respectively and ii) a ratio of 1.9 of W1W2 to W3/Bilateral. In addition to this, Program Participants submitted a forecast of expenditure for the entire year and the analysis shows that W1W2 funds will be 100% executed and that W3/Bilateral expenses will be 11% (USD 4M) below the amount promised in the POWB but the ratio will still reach a promising 1.6. At program participant level, some of Centers will be followed up as they seem to be below their target.

12.3 2018 Plan of work and budget

(a) Plan of Work

The format for the POWB is that being proposed by the System Office (SO), but the decision by the SO on the final format is pending. Implementation is proceeding according to plan and at this point there is little need for changes from the Phase II proposal. Thus the entries in

Table 4 (indicators and targets) are directly from the Phase II proposal. Indicators may change as a result of a “harmonization” process across all CRPs (a process being conducted by the SO). Once the new indicator set is ready CCAFS may need to make adjustments. CCAFS plans to check the realism of the CCAFS targets against what is achieved in 2017, but to do this we need to wait for the 2017 annual reports. Table 5 (milestones) has had some minor adjustments from the Phase II proposal. These changes have been indicated.

Flagship 1 expects projects to contribute to several major outcomes in 2018, including at least two countries using CCAFS research evidence and scenario processes to inform plans and policies related to climate change and agriculture or food and nutrition security. Other major outcomes planned include more than \$100 million of CSA investments at the World Bank informed directly or indirectly by CCAFS science and research outputs and two national level agricultural sector policies in Uganda and Tanzania approved and implementation started. Major outputs in 2018 will include training modules for African countries on NDC implementation delivered through two regional training courses and made available online, a synthesis report of CCAFS policy engagement activities in five regions, and a gap analysis of current and future global nutrient production by commodity, farming system and farm size.

Flagship 2 plans for outcomes in 2018 focus using evidence from climate smart villages, the CSA compendium and other F2 research to influence the direction and substance major CSA investments. Scaling out strategies of CSVs in South Asia are also planned to come to fruition, as will work on incentive mechanisms through cocoa and coffee value chains in LAM and WA. Major outputs focus on implementation of a comprehensive monitoring plan for CSVs across all regions, and continued evaluation of at least 25 practices and technologies in these sites in close collaboration with AFS CRPs. Other outputs include knowledge products on incentive mechanisms for CSA, and new CSA profiles for different regional contexts, including also value chain profiles.

Flagship 3 is planning for a number of major outcomes in 2018, with CCAFS research: informing at least two country submissions for climate finance; facilitating improved monitoring, reporting and verification of livestock emissions to better capture mitigation impacts. CCAFS has placed much emphasis on improving emissions factors, and the plan in 2018 is that the World Bank will start using these improved emission factors to assess mitigation impacts of World Bank projects. Major outputs in 2018 include suitability maps for livestock mitigation options for two countries in East Africa, a baseline study on causes of food loss and waste and drivers of emissions in 3-4 priority value chains, and an analysis of options for achieving gender and mitigation outcomes in agroforestry.

Flagship 4 expects major outcomes in 2018 focused on adoption of CCAFS research outputs for implementation of climate services, early warning systems and insurance. CCAFS partnership with the UN Global Framework for Climate Services will contribute to the development of five national climate services policies and action plans. New climate information, early warning and insurance tools will be implemented in five countries and through the regional climate centres of East and West Africa. Major outputs in 2018 will include guidance materials for developing climate services for agriculture, climate services evaluation results from four countries, and release of new tools for climate data reconstruction and analysis.

(b) Budget

The budget presented in the POWB is not from the Phase II proposal, but rather based on our current estimates for 2018. We propose that the level of W1W2 funding continues at 20.8M as in 2017 rather than with a 5% increase (as in the proposal) as the likelihood to have a larger W1W2 budget in year 2018 is low. It is too early to ask Centers to provide their estimated W3/Bilateral contributions for next year, so we have used the annual forecast estimation they presented for year 2017 during the Q2 Financial Report (USD 33M) which will be 13% below (USD 5M) below the amount in the Phase II proposal.

The budget allocation of W1W2 funds established for year 2018 has been essentially based on the 2017 allocation, but with a reallocation of the funds from those projects that will end in year 2017 to new projects (USD 1.5M in total to be reallocated). Most of these funds are FP1 (USD 1.31M / 85%). From the regional view, East Africa and South Asia have the largest amounts to be reallocated (USD 400k / 26% each). Some funds from the above will be held back to cover a new ex-post impact study (USD 75k), a CCER (USD 30k), and redoing the baseline survey (USD 100k). To date USD 288k remains unallocated. CCAFS management believes this may be wise in case there are any last minute budget cuts in 2017 and may also be useful if there is to be a shift in geographical focus.

The result of the above-mentioned changes means that (compared to 2017) FP1 has been reduced by 13% (USD 310k), FP3 3% (USD 100K), FP4 5% (USD 110k) and FP2 remains untouched. From the regional perspective, Global projects increased by 6% (USD 110k), Latin America decreased by 2% (USD 50k), East Africa, West Africa and South Asia decreased by 8% (USD 200k each) and Southeast Asia increased by 1% (USD 20k).

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.1 2016 year-end expenditure report
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.2 2017 budget and financial update
CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.3 2018 Plan of Work and Budget (Draft)

Decisions:

- To note the 2016 report on expenditure and the 2017 update
- To recommend that the CIAT Board approve the proposed 2018 POWB, including a brief on what is being done to (a) grow the W3/bilaterals and (b) how any loss of W1/W2 in 2018 would be accommodated (i.e. a contingency plan for a 10% loss of W1/W2)
- To note the issue of budget tightness and difficulties CCAFS faces in having the human capacity and financial flexibility to respond to emerging high impact opportunities (say in a new region or with new partners such as GCF) In response ISC requests PMC scope up some options for strategic investments and some options for how these might be resourced. ISC asks the Director to again consider the value of a senior position in the core team (evolved from the role formerly played by Sonya V) that could help with strategic synthesis, high level engagement, responsiveness to non-traditional opportunities and fund raising.
- With specific reference to W3 and bilateral funding, to note the need to report back to underperforming Centers, but including offers of help on joint efforts to raise bilateral funds.

13) 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 2018 meeting or later meetings:

- Internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas

- Flagship 2 priority setting paper
- Linking knowledge and action: status and outlook
- Flagship 4 evaluation results, including how it is getting synergies across CGIAR Centers
- Human resources capacity development framework for climate change, including curricula
- Country and region targeting: results of the review.
- Beneficiary targeting: climate vulnerable, poorest of the poor, market-connected?
- CCAFS East Africa strategy
- CCAFS role as an integrative CRP: Lessons learnt

Documents:

None

Decisions:

To prioritize the following agenda items for the 2018 ISC meeting:

- CCAFS East Africa strategy
- CCAFS role as an integrative CRP: Lessons learnt
- Strategic internal funding and flexibility – report on PMC considerations and options arising
- Evolution in geographical focus; current and outlook
- Provocative science session, e.g. transformational adaptation in agriculture
- Energy-climate nexus across flagships
- Cutting edge impact engagement: Higher level global strategic engagements, e.g. UNFCCC, GCF, etc. and non-ODA funding
- Gender and youth strategy and results update
- 10 min slots for ISC members to give overview of their work

14) Future meetings, dates and place

There are various options for location of upcoming ISC meetings:

- Wageningen University & Research/the Netherlands
- Columbia University, for their World Project
- Ethiopia, because of the upcoming East Africa strategy review
- Southeast Asia or Latin America, as CCAFS has not been to either in recent years

As for previous years, one virtual and one face-to-face meeting is suggested for next year

Documents:

None

Decisions:

- To decide to have one virtual and one face-to-face meeting in 2018
- To decide on the location for the face-to-face meeting at the April meeting, based on strategic opportunities to engage with partners

15) ISC self-assessment

Please refer to the background document with the summarized ISP self-assessment results from the previous meeting in Senegal. The ratings are overall good with some room for improvement, especially regarding the virtual meetings.

Documents:

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 15.1 ISP self-assessment ISP11 Sept 2016

Decisions:

- To note the results of the survey
- To reiterate the importance of ISC members completing the self-assessment survey

16) AOB

Documents:

Decisions:

- To nominate individual ISC members to give a first response on specific agenda items
- ISC members to have the opportunity to ask questions of clarification to RPLs and FPLs ahead of meeting if necessary.
- CCAFS PMU to offer an introduction to CCAFS and ISC meetings to new ISC members

List of documents

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.1.1 Agenda

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.1.2 Annotated Agenda

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.1 CCAFS ISC1 Minutes

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous ISC Meetings

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.3 List of Acronyms and abbreviations

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 2.2.4 Paper on the CSV approach accepted in Ecology and Society (unrevised version)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.1 [2016 Annual Performance Monitoring Report](#)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.2 [CCAFS Annual Report 2016: The power of partnerships](#)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 3.3 Figure from draft publication on principles to achieve development outcomes

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 4.1 [CSA programming and Indicator tool](#)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.1 FP1 presentation

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.2 Phase II proposal for Flagship 1

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.3 Flagship 1 projects and links (Table showing portfolio of projects and links to project pages)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.4 Summary of FP4 deliverables 2010-2016

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.5 Summary of FP4 outcomes 2012-2016

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.1.6 List of flagship-related science issues

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.1 Flagship 3 Phase II proposal 2017-2022

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.2 FP3 Portfolio 2017-2018 projects and links

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.3 FP3 deliverables and outcomes 2010-2016

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.4 FP3 issues summary

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.2.5 FP3 presentation on science for impact

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.3.1 CCAFS Success stories from South Asia (*forthcoming*)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 5.3.2 Regional CCAFS strategy

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 6.1 Draft paper: "Assessments of climate change impacts on global crop yields are exaggerated" by Pramod Aggarwal, Shalika Vyas, Philip Thornton, Bruce Campbell, and Martin Kropff

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 7.1 Evaluations and reviews

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 7.2 CCAFS Info Note June 2017_Assessing the influence of CCAFS climate data and tools (includes web links to Volumes 1-4 of the full report).

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 8.1 Country and portfolio targeting

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.1 Responding to global change: A theory of change approach to making agricultural research for development outcome-based, Agricultural Systems 152

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.2 Updated list of publications documenting CCAFS work around theory of change

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 9.3 Insights into Theory of Change thinking

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 10.1 CCAFS fund raising strategy

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 10.2 CCAFS fund raising strategy; lessons learnt and future strategy (presentation)

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 11.1 CCAFS Risk Management Catalogue 2017

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.1 2016 year-end expenditure report

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.2 2017 budget and financial update

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 12.3 2018 Plan of Work and Budget

CCAFS ISC2 Sept 2017 15.1 ISP self-assessment ISP11 Sept 2016