

CRP PORTFOLIO ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT 2011¹

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Key Messages	2
Emergence of a more coherent programmatic approach	3
Highlights from the CRPs	3
Research progress	3
Methodologies	5
Transition to a CRP portfolio	6
The development and planning of the CRPs	6
Integration of ongoing programs and projects into the CRPs	6
Cultural change	7
Gender	8
Managing inter-CRP Linkages	9
Developing partnerships	9
Setting up management systems	10
Budgetary Policies	11
Financial Reports	11
CRP portfolio analysis: The Future	11

Annexes

ANNEX A : Status of CRP Portfolio as of December 31st 2011	13
ANNEX B: Number of Centers in each CRP	14
ANNEX C: Center expenditures by CRP	15
ANNEX D: CRP Expenditure Detail	16
ANNEX E: CGIAR PRINCIPLES, As adopted by the Fund Council on November 2, 2010	17

Table and Boxes

Table 1: The five CGIAR Research Programs operational for 6 months or more of 2011	2
Box 1: Key Innovations from the CRPs	4
Box 2: Improved Research Methodologies	5
Box 3 Integration Challenges from the CRPs	6
Box 4. Efforts to bring about cultural change in the CRPs and the Centers	7
Box 5 Progress on Gender	8
Box 6: Strengthening of partnerships in the CRPs	9
Box 7: Establishment of Novel Management Structures	10

¹ In March 2012 the Fund Council approved the format of the reporting templates by the Consortium for the reporting of progress in CRPs during 2011. It was acknowledged that these templates were a novel development for the CGIAR and would thus be adopted on a trial basis during an interim period of one year, with a view to improving them after lessons were drawn from the experience.

Introduction

The CGIAR has a wealth of knowledge and experience in key areas that contribute to its four System Level Outcomes (SLOs). Special strengths include research to increase the production of crop, tree and animal commodities important to the poor, research on natural resource management, including the conservation and improved use of water, soils and forests, and social science and economic and policy research that benefits the poor by increasing their access to agricultural resources, food and markets. A far-reaching reform process, described in the Strategy and Results Framework (SRF), resulted, in 2011, in the commissioning of the first of a new set of fifteen large and ambitious CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) driven by their potential impact on development. The adoption of an agricultural research-for-development (R4D) approach throughout the system means that all research priorities and activities will be guided by their potential contributions to the four SLOs. The CGIAR system as a whole is responsible for impact that will be assessed through a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework that aims to reduce duplication, provide evidence and present the relevance, scientific value, efficiency and effectiveness of CRPs and Centers. This first portfolio level report synthesizes experience with the five CRPs which were operational for 6 months or more during 2011 (the status of the whole portfolio as of the 31st December 2011 is provided in Annex A).

Table 1. The five CGIAR Research Programs operational for 6 months or more of 2011

Name (Operating name)	Start Date
CGIAR Research Program on Rice (GRiSP)	January 1 st 2011
CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and food Security (CCAFS)	January 1 st 2011
CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS)	July 1 st 2011
CGIAR Research Program on Maize (MAIZE)	July 1 st 2011
CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (ForestsTreesAgroforestry)	July 1 st 2011

This report covers the period 1st January – 31st December 2011, and reviews the CRP Annual Reports and information sources, to identify the key issues (specifically in terms of progress towards outputs, outcomes and SLOs) arising from the CRPs, and factors that have influenced these, that are of relevance to the emerging CRP portfolio. The report continues with an analysis of the issues that have been noted in the CRP reports and suggests how improvements can be made to increase the effectiveness of the CRPs and their contributions to the SLOs in the future.

Experiences have been different for the CRPs, and therefore the issues that are presented hereafter may not have been articulated by all of the CRPs. The CGIAR CRP Portfolio is emerging. At this point, it is a grouping of individually developed research programs, which were approved, funded and started up at different points in time. The challenge remains to make them work together as a portfolio and thus contribute to a shared set of SLOs. Both the CRPs and the Consortium are aware of this and will continue to strengthen mechanisms for supporting effective interactions among CRPs to arrive at a coherent and well articulated portfolio.

Key messages

The individual CRP annual reports for 2011 demonstrate how important it is for the CGIAR to define a more focused R4D agenda, in comparison with that of the pre-reform era, so that each CRP contributes in a planned manner to the strategic results expected from the entire portfolio. In order for the CRPs to contribute jointly and cumulatively to a shared set of development outcomes leading to the four SLOs of poverty reduction, improved food security, nutrition and sustainable resource

management, the CGIAR Consortium will ensure that the SRF, in its next iteration, is sufficiently focused through a transparent set of criteria and priorities that reflect both the demands from our national and regional partners, and the need for the CGIAR to produce international public goods (IPG) within the international R4D institutional landscape. The SRF Action Plan addresses this and the next Portfolio Annual Report should bring more concrete examples of this greater strategic focus.

Emergence of a more coherent programmatic approach. In their development and early planning, the CRPs have catalyzed an intense process of reflection and rationalization, allowing Center scientists' mechanisms to rationalize, connect and develop research programs that hold the promise of greater impact. This is an evolutionary process that also takes into account bilaterally funded projects, bringing them into the new frameworks developed under CRPs. It is early in this process, but there are already some notable achievements (see Box 1).

The Consortium is taking the reform seriously and implementing a deep **cultural change from a Center-focused to a Program-focused research** agenda. This takes time, so in this first year of functioning (half a year for 3 of the CRPs), one of the significant accomplishments is the creation of entirely new teams of scientists that have already started work on a results-oriented research agenda, aligned with the CRP proposal. This time investment, upfront, is expected to bring about more development-oriented results and outcomes within the second year of implementation of the CRPs, and greater impacts in the longer-term. In terms of new working relationships, we already note a major expansion as a result of the inclusive CRP design phase

In 2011, many **outputs and outcomes were produced**, some based upon Center projects that started before the reform, as could be expected, and others that are the result of the new, programmatic way of working, in spite of the need to put in place new teams and learn how to work together on a scale never reached previously. This augurs well for the continuing implementation of the reform.

Highlights from the CRPs

Research progress. The outputs and outcomes achieved in 2011, were, as could be expected, largely a result of ongoing projects. The 2011 CRP annual reports discuss both actual and potential impact of their research. They report on outputs but in most cases without describing the significance of these outputs for development outcomes or system-level strategic results. This reflects reporting, in the main, on pre-reform projects whose outcome and impact mapping were not fully aligned with that of CRPs, as well as the short duration of the reporting period during which most of the CRPs focused on getting up and running. CRP Leaders have described this as the legacy of funded projects, approved before the reform, and the incipient stage of most CRPs. It is clear that from 2012 onward, more attention will be required, from each CRP, on the quantification of the significance of the outputs and outcomes produced through agreed upon indicators. The SRF Action Plan, now under formulation, will develop a process to arrive at an agreement on these measures.

Box 1. Key Innovations from the CRPs

CRPs' impact on the Global Climate Change Agenda

CCAFS have been contributing to discussions on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). CCAFS with other agencies played a major part in 2011 in agriculture being referred to the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) for detailed discussion. This was a process that had been stalled at the UNFCCC during COP15 and COP16. If agriculture is fully incorporated into the agreements emerging from the UNFCCC then greater levels of climate finance to farming communities, and more attention to capacity building and technology transfer in the agricultural sector should be expected.

Meanwhile, in Durban in 2011 the UNFCCC adopted the **ForestsTreesAgroforestry** proposed approach to setting reference levels (RLs) and Reference Emission Levels (RELs) critical for enabling countries to receive REDD+ payments.

Global rice information gateway

Global market prices for rice are volatile. Runaway prices, like those of the 2008 rice crisis, could have been prevented had the right people been given the right information at the right time. In 2011, **GRiSP** began to develop a global rice information gateway to provide timely and accurate information to decision makers in rice-growing countries. The global rice information gateway will provide real-time crop condition reports; short- to medium-term projections of production, consumption, trade, and prices under different domestic and trade policy regimes and macro conditions; and national, subnational, and household survey data.

Reach through partnerships

Responding to volatile and rising food prices, **MAIZE** has initiated, in collaboration with the Mexican Government, systems based approaches to increase the productivity, profitability, sustainability and the resilience of maize based systems in seven agro-eco regions in Mexico. After one year, MasAgro is working with more than 80 partner organizations and has established farmer and market participatory research on more than 20,000 hectares. The rapid scale up of knowledge intensive innovation systems potential is remarkable and should also provide key lessons for the wider scaling up of knowledge adoption.

New rice varieties for millions of farmers in

GRiSP has released Swarna-Sub1, which can remain underwater for up to 2 weeks and recover once the water subsides, as a variety for submergence-prone areas in India, Nepal, and Bangladesh. The target is for this variety to be grown on more than 6 million hectares in South Asia. In sub-Saharan Africa, in 2011, a total of 78 NERICA (New Rice for Africa) varieties were adopted on a total of 0.7-1 million hectares. In 2011, farmers who had participated in NERICA-rice project activities benefited from additional income of US\$14.4 million, while the spinoff to nonparticipant farmers is estimated at \$28.7 million—a total of \$43.1 million. In Latin America, CIAT and the Latin American Fund for Irrigated Rice (FLAR) have been developing rice with a “Latin flavour”—varieties better suited to the region’s conditions and widespread practice of direct seeding—to break current yield barriers.

Aquaculture development triples benefits for thousands of farmers

By 2011 over 22,500 aquaculture farmers had increased their annual profits to US\$1075 per household over a baseline of US\$356 in 2008. This impact came from the USAID funded project “Greater Harvest and Economic Returns from Shrimp” (GHERS), through focusing on the productive capacity of shrimp and fish farms in coastal districts of Bangladesh. The project has been incorporated into **AAS** and aligned with its research agenda, and the cross-cutting CRP work in Bangladesh (see below).

Novel Climate Analogues Tool

CCAFS has developed the novel Analogues tool to support climate and crop models with on-the-

ground empirical testing. It helps stakeholders “view the future climate today”. The analogues tool connects sites with statistically similar (‘analogous’) climates, across space (i.e. between locations) and/or time (i.e. with past or future climates). Once analogue sites are identified, information from local field studies or databases can be used and compared to provide data for further studies, propose high-potential adaptation pathways, facilitate farmer-to-farmer exchange of knowledge, validate computational models, test new technologies and/or techniques, or enable us to learn from history. Users may manipulate the tool in the free, open-source R software, or access a simplified user-friendly version online. This tool will greatly increase the scope of farmer-led action research on climate-smart options. The tool has emerged as a result of new partnerships in CCAFS with the global change research community.

Methodologies. The 5 CRPs have reported the development of novel methodologies for bringing about impact through research. A selection of these is presented in Box 2.

Box 2. Improved Research Methodologies

GRiSP is pioneering applications of ICT in both research and technology dissemination activities. Cell phones are being used by field staff and village volunteers to collect field data and real-time information to complement conventional instruments of socio-economic surveys. Farmers and extension workers in the Philippines are getting field-specific nutrient best management guidelines through mobile phone applications of a computer-based decision tool, *Nutrient Manager for Rice (NMRice)*. *NMRice* provides farmers with fertilizer recommendations on the basis of where their field is (geographically) located, the variety of rice they use and when it was sown, the availability of irrigation water, how they manage crop residues, and the yield history of the field. *NMRice* is now being adapted to Sahelian conditions and a prototype *NMRice* is going through field testing and validation in Mali and Senegal.

ForestsTreesAgroforestry is developing and using approaches that build on traditional and indigenous knowledge to harness the opportunities intrinsic to the planet’s vast tree diversity, for instance through improvements to seed-seedling systems (including nurseries) and the protection of wild fruit species (such as in Central Asian Republics).

CCAFS conducted baseline surveys through collaboration of many Centers and partners, at 15 benchmark sites in three regions and 12 countries. More than 6,000 households were surveyed with data being gender disaggregated. In what is believed to be an unprecedented step for the CGIAR, the household survey data were available to the public within six months of final field data collection. Survey manuals, data sets and site reports are publicly available through the CCAFS website.

MAIZE is implementing the Seed of Discovery Strategic Initiative to comprehensively study and classify the genotypes of CGIAR and partners’ seed collections. Molecular characterization (next generation, high-throughput sequencing) combined with field trials will make available the untapped wealth contained in the world’s native maize genetic resources – novel alleles and adaptive traits - as an international public good. This effort, of unprecedented scope, applying new molecular technologies, is funded and implemented in collaboration with the government of Mexico and international partners.

To ensure an appropriate focus from the beginning **AAS** is reassessing its entire research portfolio in terms of coherence and the extent to which it provides a foundation for bringing about development change. This will identify the best methodologies (as well as outputs) to be used in the CRP. **AAS** is also developing a novel transformative approach to addressing key constraints to women’s access to involvement in research processes and research outputs.

Transition to a CRP portfolio.

The development and planning of the CRPs. CRP proposals were developed in parallel and individually, rather than as a portfolio. The CRPs were based on the criteria jointly agreed between the Consortium, the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) and the Fund Council (FC) and with the then SRF in mind². The FC's request for fast-tracked CRPs hastened the process. The very tight schedules did not allow addressing of CRP Portfolio issues such as managing inter-CRP linkages, strengthening gender research across the portfolio, developing harmonized operational plans and governance structures, working together on data and knowledge management, management of overlaps and gaps in the agenda, and critically, doing strategic planning in the context of a performance management framework (there was no articulation of the SLOs when the CRPs were approved). In 2011 a strong emphasis was put by the Consortium on addressing gender issues across the portfolio and some work was initiated to develop criteria for the selection of common research site and implementation plans among some CRPs, best shown by the emerging work in Bangladesh highlighted below. There is much to still do in relation to harmonization and achieving coherence in the whole portfolio, including in the way existing research is integrated into CRPs (Box 3 provides some examples), and this is one of the 2013 Consortium priorities, as already mentioned.

Integration of ongoing programs and projects into the CRPs. One of the reasons for the reform was to move away from the fragmentation of the research agenda (with more than 3000 funded projects, often of just a few years duration) toward a programmatic approach in which much larger programs are funded for longer periods based on their expected outputs and outcomes. This process of incorporation takes time; and this is apparent in the reporting of the CRPs. Whilst there are some notable achievements e.g. influencing global policy, many of the outputs and outcomes reported by the CRPs are still relatively atomized, as many reflect on-going research projects. CGIAR Centers continue to source bilateral funds from donors for research projects that are aligned with CRP proposals. Some CRPs have had to negotiate with donors who seek outcomes which are not in alignment with those of the CRPs.

Box 3. Integration Challenges from the CRPs

MAIZE has a relatively high level of ongoing bilateral funding (only 19% of its targeted budget is coming from Windows 1 & 2). One of its challenges, and opportunities, is to successfully transform nine Strategic Initiatives into nine effective work teams which are aligned towards one common vision of success. On the funding side, MAIZE has been very successful in aligning the content of significant bilateral and window 3 projects with its overall strategy.

During the transition years when pre-existing projects are being completed only projects that contribute to developing IPGs under one or more of the 6 research themes of the program will be included in **AAS**. In some instances, however, new opportunities to develop AAS relevant research will emerge in other countries. As these opportunities are considered, priority will be given to those countries and locations that lie in one of the large aquatic systems that are the focus of the program, namely Asia's mega deltas, African fresh water systems, and coastal and coral reef systems in Asia Pacific.

CCAFS inherited on-going work from 15 Centers. Different Centers have different priorities and ways of working that are not always in line with the CCAFS strategy. The PMC³ and ISP⁴ have set a target of three years to phase out non-strategic work and get greater strategic coherence. All proposed Center activities for 2012 were rated for relevance and Centers received feedback on

² The Strategy and Results Framework was approved in the revised form by the Funders Forum in April 2011

³ PMC: Program Management Committee

⁴ ISP: Independent Science Panel

the degree to which their portfolio was aligned with CCAFS. Budgets to Centers in 2012 were altered by up to 24% on the basis of two criteria, the more important of which was “strategic fit”. Furthermore, strategic priorities for additional investment have been identified and communicated with Centers – and those Centers taking them up have been appropriately resourced.

The three CGIAR Centers involved in rice research IRRI, AfricaRice, and CIAT, have actively looked for ways to align their rice research programs. From the end of 2008 and within the context of the CGIAR change process thinking evolved toward the development of a truly global rice R&D program, a partnership that would go beyond “just” enhanced collaboration among the three CGIAR Centers. Numerous consultations with a wide range of organisations developed an overall vision and strategy for what was to become GRiSP. Early in 2010, JIRCAS, CIRAD, and IRD joined the three CGIAR Centers as the main architects of **GRiSP**. Because of this relatively long ‘incubation time’, the six leading Centers have, by 2011, fully aligned their own research activities and relevant projects to the joint GRiSP strategy, themes, and products.

To set priorities, **GRiSP** conducted an ex-ante impact assessment of its program. For further priority setting and program adjustments, it is developing a more detailed strategic assessment of expected impact from current and possible new rice research activities. GRiSP, like most other CRPs, started from a basis of existing research, which is to 80% locked into existing bilateral grants, which were mapped onto its themes and product lines. Hence, up to 80% of the initial proposed allocation of funds was based on ongoing research, plus a number of new priorities that were identified during the CRP development process. Over time, as current bilateral grants run out or are replaced, more flexibility in resource allocation according to the new priorities will emerge.

Cultural change. The reform and the CRPs represent a deep change in modus operandi for the CGIAR. The CRPs involve different approaches to collaboration – across Centers (Annex B) and with partners. This requires a significant cultural change in the CGIAR – and cultural change takes time. Many initiatives to foster cultural change were embarked on in 2011, though it is recognized that this will be a significant theme in 2012 and beyond. These initiatives involved, for example, giving greater roles for partners in governance mechanisms, catalyzing collaboration amongst Centers, task forces to provide synergies to research efforts, pooling scarce human resources, and major inter-centre efforts to enhance communication and dissemination (Box 4).

Box 4. Efforts to bring about cultural change in the CRPs and the Centers

There has been an upsurge in collaboration amongst centers around common research and development themes.

CCAFS hosted an annual science meeting with representatives of all 15 Centers to reflect on progress and identify gaps and weaknesses. CCAFS has initiated a number of data sharing platforms (e.g. www.agtrials.org, which collates trial data from across the CGIAR) and work in the CCAFS research sites involves multiple Centers that can share information and hardware (e.g. baseline survey data, weather stations). A third of the members of the CCAFS management team are from partner University organisations outside the CGIAR. CCAFS hosted a joint meeting with the global environmental change community to identify key areas where the CGIAR and global research communities could collaborate. Several ideas from that meeting are being implemented.

MAIZE has facilitated farming-systems focused innovation platforms within major bilateral programs, in Mexico, Africa and South Asia, involving four of the six maize-based systems prioritized within the MAIZE strategy. Even though working in different geographic regions of the world, cultures and partners, opportunities are being identified to integrate approaches, assure cross-platform learning and to identify opportunities for cooperation with other CRPs.

GRiSP organized more than a dozen international workshops to develop new global and regional research initiatives and partnerships. Half of the GRiSP management team is from partner agencies (JIRCAS, IRD, CIRAD). This team met several times in 2011, usually remotely, to cut down on travel costs. GRiSP launched five Africa-wide Task Forces in 2011 to provide synergy to research efforts across the continent.

Gender. The reform has given CRPs a clearer focus on gender and on the need to develop proper capacity to address gender equity in research and product delivery. The CRP proposals showed great variation in the commitment to gender. Development of a Gender Strategy by each CRP following Consortium Board-approved Guidelines was initiated in 2012. Thus, 2011 should be viewed as a baseline against which we expect to see significant improvement in 2012. In 2011, CRP reporting of gender research reflects the absence in the SRF of a system-level theory of change and strategic results that explicitly integrate gender. Since CRPs lack this unifying framework for monitoring and reporting their gender-related outputs and outcomes, the 2011 CRP reports provide fragmented snippets of gender-related research derived from milestones (activities) scattered in Program log-frames. Overall, the quality of reporting on gender is highly uneven with more attention given to the process of integrating gender into the research agenda than to the significance for key aspects of program design such as targeting and priority setting. Making collective, portfolio-level sense out of individual CRP gender results can only be accomplished with a supporting logical framework that defines shared, system-level gender outcomes. The SRF Action Plan will be an opportunity to reform this situation.

A Consortium-level Gender strategy, based on extensive consultations, was approved by the Consortium Board in December 2011. It contains guidelines for CRP-level gender strategies which the Consortium requested all CRPs to develop within 6 months of inception. In December 2011 the Consortium recruited a Senior Gender Advisor, who has been supporting development of these strategies. Four of the five CRPs had draft gender strategies in 2011 (AAS, CCAFS, ForestsTreesAgroforestry, GRiSP). Provision of a hypothesis and baseline analysis that address the significance of gender for the achievement of Program outputs and outcomes in the reports is mixed. Attention to gender budgeting is uneven. Overall, those that did report Gender Strategy development provide evidence that progress was made in 2011 with the integration of gender into research.

Box 5. Progress on Gender

AAS published a Program Gender Strategy to guide their transformative gender action research agenda; strengthened staff capacity in gender analysis and transformative gender research; established strategic partnerships with leading partners in gender research and advanced the development of a unified methodology for testing transformative gender approaches. In its management structure AAS has almost achieved gender balance.

CCAFS developed a draft Gender Strategy. The Program's Independent Science Panel identified gender as one of several areas requiring increased investment. For 2012 CCAFS added two new gender Milestones and integrated gender into work plans to provide for implementation of the Program's gender strategy. CCAFS initiated baseline surveys that include exploration of gender disparities at the 15 CCAFS benchmark sites in three regions and 12 countries.

ForestsTreesAgroforestry formed a cross-Program team of gender researchers from the four participating Centers with responsibility to work with Component Coordinators to implement gender-relevant objectives of the Program. Individuals were identified with an interest and background in gender analysis who would work together with Component Coordinators and scientists to implement the gender-relevant objectives of the CRP. The coordination team is led by CIFOR and includes focal points from ICRAF and Bioversity. A Gender Strategy and

operational work plan with gender budget were developed for 2012. Substantive research was published on the gender implications of improved value chains for non-timber forest products.

GRiSP developed a draft Gender Strategy, work plan and formed a cross-cutting support team. GRiSP's main gender-related activities include strategic research that will identify gender-equitable rice R4D and extension programs, mainstreaming the use of gender differentiation and gender analysis in adaptive research processes, building and enhancing capacities of women scientists engaged in rice Research, Development and Extension and using innovative strategies to empower grassroots women with technical knowledge and skills. Research milestones achieved include identification of the implications for breeding of gender-related constraints and varietal trait preferences.

While a wide range of **MAIZE** related projects and initiatives use gender as an analytical tool, the CRP challenges researchers to find more avenues that lead to greater empowerment of women and young adults. The CRP developed plans to implement a Gender Audit in 2012, which will cover the research and institutional domains.

Managing inter-CRP Linkages. Linkages between CRPs will require further definition and dedicated management of time and effort in future. The scope and dimension of such linkages range from simple timely information exchange to sharing infrastructure to jointly developing research projects. Currently, linkages are worked on through communities of practice and through shared sites. For example, in 2011 plans were developed for the Khulna hub in Bangladesh, originally established by the Challenge Program on Water and Food, to have 7 CRPs led by AAS (Policies, WHEAT, GRiSP, Nutrition, LWE⁵ and CCAFS) working together. A risk of working with a large diversity of partners is losing in integration and coherence. Harmonization is a priority of the Consortium, and several initiatives were begun in 2011 (e.g. meeting of science leaders in the CRPs and the Centers to initiate the discussions, meeting of communications officers to define branding procedures, testing of new platforms for internal communication etc⁶).

Developing partnerships (with non-CGIAR partners). In 2011 partnerships within the CRPs were significantly strengthened on a number of fronts (Box 6).

Box 6. Strengthening of partnerships in the CRPs

CCAFS is a joint initiative between the CGIAR and the Earth Systems Science Partnership (ESSP). The ESSP is the umbrella organization for the world's greatest concentration of global change scientists. The ESSP partners are part of the governance system and are also represented on the management committee of CCAFS.

MAIZE and **GRiSP** and have both developed Competitive Partner Grants. These enable a prioritization of partners and ensure that partners have greater control over activities they are engaged upon. The MAIZE grants are based on an annually reserved budget to bring in third parties. Through its bilateral portfolio, partner involvement in MAIZE increases consistently year after year.

GRiSP collaborated with UNEP to establish the Sustainable Rice Platform to develop and promote standards for good agricultural practices and mainstream sustainable practices throughout the rice supply chain through public and private sector partnerships. Large regional projects such as CSISA⁷, STRASA⁸, and Green Super Rice bring together not only GRiSP CG centers and their NARES and ARI partners, but as well other CG Centers (such as WorldFish, CIMMYT, IFPRI, ILRI) and their partners,

⁵ Land Water and Ecosystems

⁶ See CGIAR annual report 2011

⁷ CSISA – Cereal System Initiative for South Asia

⁸ STRASA: Stress-Tolerant Rice for Farm Households in Africa and South Asia

forming bridges among CRPs (e.g. GRiSP, MAIZE, WHEAT, and AAS). A GRiSP Coordinating Committee was formed in Japan, and a French Rice Science Partnership (FRISP) brought together a large number of French institutions involved in rice research.

Setting up management systems. Realignment of management systems has taken place across the CRPs, with some guidelines from the Consortium and enlightened considerations in both the management of the CRPs and elements of the CRPs (Box 7). As well as management structures, GRiSP, CCAFS and MAIZE have established progressive management tools, both in terms of operational plans and progress and financial monitoring. AAS also felt that there was a risk that they would not be able to utilize the services of appropriate people to work on their CRP from other Centers. ForestsTreesAgroforestry believed that there was a risk of conflict if boundaries between CRPs were not sufficiently clear. When describing risks three CRPs mentioned the rapid start up.

Box 7. Establishment of Novel Management Structures

CRPs have developed novel management structures and approaches:

GRiSP: has strengthened its links with key international research partners by bringing them into its management team, as mentioned above. The GRiSP Oversight Committee includes 7 international experts (non CGIAR), 5 BOT members from IRRI, AfricaRice and CIAT, and the DGs of IRRI and AfricaRice (ex officio). In 2011, IRRI's Deputy Director General for Research also acted as Director of GRiSP. At the subprogram level, Global Theme leaders have been appointed as well as regional theme leaders for Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and thematic contact persons at CIRAD, IRD and JIRCAS. These theme leaders/contact persons also serve as institutional science leaders and hence no additional management layer has been introduced.

AAS: AAS has taken specific steps to reduce costs in some key areas. With the appointment of the Program Oversight Panel WorldFish has dissolved its own Science Advisory Committee. Similarly, rather than establish the position of CRP leader as another management cost, WorldFish has appointed its Deputy Director General to lead the program. By the end of 2011 the governance and management arrangements had been established and gender parity was almost reached.

The **CCAFS** Independent Science Panel (ISP) held its first meetings in 2011. It consists of individuals from outside the CGIAR, from research and development agencies, with observers from the lead centre board and Earth Systems Science Partnership (ESSP). It focused its attention on the CCAFS business (implementation) plan, and in particular ensuring that certain strategic topics considered to be weak in the current portfolio were appropriately resourced. A further topic on their agenda was the selection of two new regions where CCAFS would operate.

MAIZE: The MAIZE Management Committee is comprised of members from CIMMYT, IITA, the Kenyan NARS, SAGARPA (Mexican MoA) and the Syngenta Foundation for Sustainable Agriculture), reflecting the CRPs major partner categories (e.g. CGIAR Centers, NARS, private sector). It held its first meeting in October 2011 in Delhi.

Budgetary Policies

Similar to the development of the research portfolios, the budgets for all the CRPs were developed with some variable approaches to budget construction. There are inconsistencies in the treatment of overhead, growth scenarios, pass-through funds, bilateral funding, full cost recovery policies, CRP management costs, gender budgeting, and the 2% Cost-Sharing Percentage (CSP). Obviously, this was undesirable but the budget proposals were accepted when the CRP proposals were approved, and now have legal substance as they form part of the PIA for each CRP.

Despite the differences in the budgeting approaches, all CGIAR centers operate in accordance with the Cost Allocation Rules as set out in CGIAR Financial Guideline No. 5. The oversight functions of

Lead Centers, Internal Auditors and the Consortium Office also encourage proper financial management. Considering that 2011 and 2012 are transition years as the business model changes for the whole CGIAR, it is understandable that there was some presentational variability in these early years.

Financial Reports

Each of the CRPs provided a 2011 financial report, and these have been consolidated into two summary reports, provided here as Annexes. Annex C sets out the utilization of funds from Windows 1 and 2, per CRP and per Center. Understandably, the biggest expenditure was from GRiSP and CCAFS, as they started 1 January. All centers at least had some involvement with the CRPs, especially because of CCAFS, but at this early stage of implementation, the degree of participation in the CRPs by the CGIAR Centers varied greatly. Annex D provides more detail, namely the classification of expenditure, and also the utilization of W3 Funds and Bilateral Grants into the CRPs.

CRP portfolio analysis: The Future

The 2011 Portfolio Level Annual Report provides a first understanding of the operation of the CRP portfolio. It highlights issues which will need to be continually monitored to assess progress and guide the evolution of the portfolio. These include the following.

- A. **Outputs and Outcomes** – As presented in the CRP-level reports, the outputs and outcomes are fragmented. As they stand, there can be no analysis to show the CGIAR contribution towards the SLOs, given that most reporting is on pre-reform projects and that CRPs do not have common or jointly defined outcomes. The development of a portfolio of agreed, common Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) will provide measures against which contributions by several CRPs to any given outcome can be assessed with the significance of outputs for progress towards these outcomes explained. This is a top priority for the Consortium Office in 2013.
- B. **Transition to a CRP Approach:** The transition to a CRP and portfolio approach involves multi-faceted change including cultural change, financial reporting, partnerships, management systems and gender strategies as described earlier. The SRF Action Plan and the Performance Management System will provide guidance in this transition, but strong and effective management will also be required. The CGIAR Principle⁹ on collaborative working towards System agendas should provide the vision for this evolution. Over the next three or more years, bilaterally funded activities will need to be aligned more closely with the research themes of the CRPs.
- C. **Gender in the CRPs:** It was only in late 2011 that the structures for integration of gender in research were established. 2012 should show progress on this front for individual CRPs, as they present their Gender Strategy and gender budgeting. In 2013, the SRF Action Plan provides an important opportunity to address the issue of gender at the portfolio level.
- D. **Funding and Budgetary Policies:** 2011 will provide a baseline for the co-ordination of funding, particularly the contribution to Windows 1 and 2. A major issue reported by most CRPs was the uncertainty of timing on disbursements in this new business model. Reserves were utilized to ensure continuity of operations.
- E. **Managing inter-CRP linkages:** In late 2011 the first meeting of the Science Leaders (DDGs-Research and CRP Leaders) was held. During this meeting, it was planned that the Science Leaders group would become a mechanism for facilitating the implementation of effective interactions among the CRPs (e.g. gaps, overlaps, selecting research sites, sharing baseline data, etc.). As all CRPs start functioning, the role of this group will need to gain momentum; the Consortium Office plans to facilitate and support this new role.

⁹ Principles are presented in Annex E

- F. **Developing partnerships:** Partnerships are not only a critical element for success of individual CRPs, but also for developing and maintaining an interrelated portfolio of research programs; they will increasingly be a priority for the Consortium Office. How to optimize partnerships for research and development and utilize lessons learnt in this will be critical for the evolution of the CRPs.
- G. **Management Systems:** Several approaches to streamlining management systems are being established by the CRPs corresponding to the CGIAR Principle on governance and accountability (Annex E). The next Portfolio level report will include analyses of the management structures so that lessons can be drawn and harmonization implemented where appropriate. It should also reflect on the connection between CGIAR Change Management Objectives and CRP Portfolio progress.

Results-orientation towards a System agenda: During 2013 the SRF Action Plan will start being implemented which will affect the objectives of the CRPs through developing IDOs. These IDOs will link the research programs to the SLOs and the prioritization among and within the CRPs. The IDOs will be incorporated into the CGIAR Performance Management System (PMS). The PMS will be reflected in future reporting and analysis.

ANNEX A : Status of CRP Portfolio as of December 31st 2011

Name of CRP	Start Date	Comments
CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Systems	January 2012	Unconditional approval of 1 year inception period
CGIAR Research Program on Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics		Pending approval
CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems	July 2011	
CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets	January 2012	
CGIAR Research Program on Wheat	January 2012	
CGIAR Research Program on Maize	July 2011	
CGIAR Research Program on Rice	January 2011	
CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas	October 2011	
CGIAR Research Program on Grain Legumes		Pending approval
CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Cereals		Pending approval
CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish	January 2012	
CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health	January 2012	
CGIAR Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems	January 2012	
CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry	July 2011	
CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security	January 2011	

ANNEX B: Number of Centers in each CRP

CRP Operating Name	Lead Center	Participating CG centers
Dryland Systems	ICARDA	8
Humidtropics	IITA	7
AAS	WFISH	4
Policies, institutions, & markets	IFPRI	11
WHEAT	CIMMYT	2
MAIZE	CIMMYT	2
GRiSP	IRRI	3
RTB	CIP	4
Grain Legumes	ICRISAT	4
Dryland Cereals	ICRISAT	2
Livestock and Fish	ILRI	4
A4NH	IFPRI	10
WLE	IWMI	13
ForestsTreesAgroforestry	CIFOR	4
CCAFS	CIAT	15
<u>Average Participation</u>		<u>6.2</u>

ANNEX C: Center expenditures by CRP

CRP	AAS	Maize	GRiSP	Forests	CCAFS	TOTALS
<u>Expenditure</u>						
Africa Rice	-	-	8 186	-	47	8 233
Bioversity	-	-	-	1 896	3 611	5 507
CIAT	-	-	4 308	26	6 016	10 350
CIFOR	-	-	-	4 555	140	4 695
CIMMYT	-	2 742	-	-	4 220	6 962
CIP	-	-	-	-	847	847
ICARDA	-	-	-	-	1 490	1 490
ICRISAT	-	-	-	-	2 133	2 133
IFPRI	-	-	-	-	514	514
IITA	-	703	-	-	838	1,541
ILRI	-	-	-	-	4 243	4 243
IRRI	-	-	22 006	-	205	22 211
IWMI	115	-	-	-	2 163	2 278
World Agroforestry	-	-	-	4 603	4 807	9 410
World Fish	2 437	-	-	-	406	2 843
Totals	2 552	3 425	34 500	11 080	31 680	83 237

Notes

All figures USD 000's

All amounts extracted from centers' audited financial statements

ANNEX D: CRP Expenditure Detail

		Personnel	Partners	Supplies	Travel	Depreciation	CSP	Indirect	Total
AAS	W1/2	902	2	817	351	18		462	2 552
	W3 & Bilateral	1 402	423	672	327	150		514	3 488
	Total	2 304	425	1 489	678	168		976	6 040
Maize	W1/2	1 354	121	1 207	127	150		466	3 425
	W3 & Bilateral	4 772	4 142	8 049	901	1 627	231	2 879	22 601
	Total	6 126	4 263	9 256	1 028	1 777		3 345	25 795
GRiSP	W1/2	12 378	914	13 379	1 387	4 422		2 020	34 500
	W3 & Bilateral	17 204	20 002	14 173	3 853	1 427		6 199	62 858
	Total	29 582	20 916	27 552	5 240	5 849		8 219	97 358
Forests	W1/2	4 297	366	2 211	854	347		3 005	11 080
	W3 & Bilateral	6 288	1 977	4 808	1 297	238		2 305	16 913
	Total	10 585	2 343	7 019	2 151	585		5 310	27 993
CCAFS	W1/2	12 245	6 295	5 724	1 205	659		5 552	31 680
	W3 & Bilateral	7 391	8 367	4 147	1 591	148		2 951	24 595
	Total	19 636	14 662	9 871	2 796	807		8 503	56 275
TOTALS	W1/2	31 176	7 698	23 338	3 924	5 596	-	11 505	83 237
	W3 & Bilateral	37 057	34 911	31 849	7 969	3 590	231	14 848	130 455
	Totals	68 233	42 609	55 187	11 893	9 186	231	26 353	213 692

Notes

All figures USD 000's

ANNEX E: CGIAR PRINCIPLES, As adopted by the Fund Council on November 2, 2010

(Sections 1-3)

1. As set forth in the CGIAR Joint Declaration endorsed by the CGIAR members on December 8, 2009, the Consortium and the Fund Council (the "Parties")¹ agree to work together through the CGIAR to reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition and enhance ecosystem resilience through high-quality international agricultural research, partnership and leadership.

2. These are the overarching Principles that guide the Fund Council and the Consortium in their joint efforts to implement the SRF in an efficient and effective manner. The Consortium and the Fund Council, through adoption of these CGIAR Principles, are committed to the strategic objectives set forth below and recognize that they have shared responsibility, as well as mutual trust and accountability, through their separate roles and obligations, for the achievement of these objectives:

- Food for People: Create and accelerate sustainable increases in the productivity and production of healthy food by and for the poor.
- Environment for People: Conserve, enhance, and sustainably use natural resources and biodiversity to improve the livelihoods of the poor in response to climate change and other factors.
- Policies for People: Promote policy and institutional change that will stimulate agricultural growth and equity to benefit the poor, especially rural women and other disadvantaged groups.

3. In furtherance of these objectives, the Parties agree to:

- Harmonize their approach to increasing and stabilizing funding for implementing international agricultural research for development through the CGIAR Fund and the Consortium, respectively.
- Manage their operations and programs to achieve the system-level results set forth in the Strategy and Results Framework.
- Work to ensure effective governance and efficient operations in the provision and use of resources, including controlling System Costs.
- Collaborate and partner with and among funders, implementers, external partners and users of SRF research.