



Fund

Fund Council

9th Meeting (FC9)—New Delhi, India

April 25-26, 2013

Comments from US and Canada on the "Proposal for a Performance Scheme to Promote Gender Integration into CGIAR Research" and Consortium Response to Comments

(The Consortium Board Chair formally withdrew the proposal tabled at FC9. Comments are for discussion only.)

*Document presented for Agenda Item 7:
Proposal for a Performance Scheme to Promote
Gender Integration into CGIAR Research*

Submitted by:
Fund Office

Comments from US and Canada on the “Proposal for a Performance Scheme to Promote Gender Integration into CGIAR Research” (Agenda Item 7)

- Competition among CRPs may be the right way, and would prefer a more collaborative approach across the system in which all CRPs are improved and strengthened.
- Using a separate budget that terminates after three years might not achieve the gender integration in CRPs and on-going support in the outer years.
- Support for gender should come from all CRP donors, whether their resources flow through Window 1, Window 2, or both. Limiting the funding for advancing gender to Window 1 misses the opportunity to utilize and build on all CRP resources.
- Alternative Approach proposed: All CRPs would revise and enhance their gender focus and outcomes and those changes would be reflected in the revised CRP budgets to be submitted to FC for approval. This approach would fully integrate gender into CGIAR funding and would not depend on a time-limited funding stream, as suggested in the Consortium proposal.
- How do the eligibility requirements consider support for CRPs that are weaker in capacity to qualify for performance funds over the three year period?
- More clarity was needed on the costs associated with budgets for gender capacity development.
- How will the scheme fit within the wider strategy and budget for supporting and promoting gender research beyond the three year period proposed by the Scheme?
- How do the eligibility requirements consider support for CRPs that are weaker in capacity to qualify for performance funds over the three year period? While the narrative suggests gender capacity development as a primary objective, the eligibility considerations outlined in Annex 1 rely on CRP's initial workplans and budgets and the capacity to implement them. How will progress be considered over time if CRPs improve and how will cases be treated where there is a clear need to improve capacity?
- Budget: Clarity on the costs associated with capacity development budget:
 - a) Are there funds allocated elsewhere within the Consortium or CRP budgets for gender capacity building? The Scheme currently seems to address capacity building primarily through the collaborative activities. The structure of the Scheme seems to favour already strong performers that invest in these areas (e.g. criteria iii in Annex 1). If this Scheme is the primary mechanism through which capacity building needs will be addressed, a risk still remains that weaker CRPs may not have the opportunity to access additional funds to build the capacity needed to fully implement their commitments on gender equality.
 - b) Is the allocation for the Senior Gender Advisor related to the position's salary or are they additional funds and for what purpose? We would consider it appropriate to maintain the salary for the Senior Gender Advisor within the Consortium Office's budget and not be subject to separate funding under a temporary mechanism.

Response to Comments from US and Canada on the “Proposal for a Performance Scheme to Promote Gender Integration into CGIAR Research” (FC9 Agenda Item 7)

CGIAR Consortium, April 16

Below please find a response to the comments from US and Canada that clarify that the proposed scheme aims to emphasize gender in ways that leverage Window 1 and Window 2 resources. It is building on the strengths of CRPs as opposed to being a new competition, and it is a step towards a fully integrated approach mainstreamed in a robust way across the next stage of CRPs. If the Fund Council supports implementation of the Gender Performance Scheme at FC9, then the Consortium will also revise the memo and proposal for the Scheme to achieve the same clarity, and share the final version with the FC.

1. Competition among CRPs versus a more collaborative approach across the system in which all CRPs are improved and strengthened.

The primary action of the Consortium to date has been focused on mainstreaming gender research in all CRPs. The Consortium has developed a CGIAR wide gender research strategy, and asked all CRPs to develop their own CRP level gender strategy (with advice, support and review of the Consortium Gender Adviser – and working with the Gender and Agriculture Network). Twelve of the fifteen CRPs have now developed a gender research strategy, seven of which have been approved by the Consortium (1.3, 2, 3.1, 3.2, 4, 6, 7) and five are still being improved (3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7; additional three expected to be final before end April). All CRPs have been asked to identify the activities and budget to implement their gender research strategies in their 2013 CRP Program of Work and Budget. Thirteen CRPs have submitted a POWB with gender integrated. This is the routine, annual commitment of budget to gender research that is representing the desired mainstreaming. Analysis of those work plans shows that the total amount of gender research activities has gone up from \$28M (in the approved CRP proposals, according to ISPC analysis, attached) to \$58M in the 2013 work plans. This is still well below the recommended 5-10% of the CGIAR Gender Scoping Study but a step in the right direction. Not only is the amount going up, but the work on gender strategies reassures us that the focus is in line with what the gender experts think are the appropriate priorities and the quality of this work has been looked at as well. The process of change is slow, however, and we propose to support and accelerate it, as explained in response to Question 3.

2. How do the eligibility requirements consider support for CRPs that are weaker in capacity to qualify for performance funds over the three year period? While the narrative suggests gender capacity development as a primary objective, the eligibility considerations outlined in Annex 1 rely on CRP's initial work plans and budgets and the capacity to implement them. How will progress be considered over time if CRPs improve and how will cases be treated where there is a clear need to improve capacity?

Starting in 2013, CRPs have been asked to submit an annual Program of Work and Budget, POWB (as the funding available to implement CRPs is much lower than what was approved by the FC in the original proposals, the initial work plans that accompanied the proposals are not a sufficient indication of de-facto activities). This means that CRPs have an opportunity each year to demonstrate progress on the development and implementation of their gender research. In their 2013 POWBs, a number of CRPs demonstrated significant progress in the implementation of the gender strategies developed in 2012 – this will be the basis for 2013 awards. In the 2014 POWBs, we expect to see progress in more CRPs and use this as a basis to make new / additional awards to more CRPs.

In mid 2012, when we conceived the Gender Performance Scheme for 3 years, the proposal to synchronize the CRP contracts to an end date of December 31, 2014, had not yet been developed. If at FC9 the Fund Council supports the synchronization proposal, then the new round of CRP proposals to be developed in 2014 does present an opportunity to complete the mainstreaming of gender research into all CRPs and integrate the gender research criteria and requirements into the Guidance for the CRP 2nd call, including gendered targets for CRP intermediate development outcomes. The duration of the Gender Performance Scheme can then be limited to two years (2013 and 2014), rather than three as originally proposed.

3. Using a separate budget that terminates after three years might not achieve the gender integration in CRPs and on-going support in the outer years.

We are proposing to support and accelerate the mainstreaming process, through the Gender Performance Scheme. It is already moving in the right direction, as referred to above in our response to Question 1, but it is going slow for at least several reasons:

- As ISPC noted many CRPs budgeted inadequate resources for gender research, and with actual levels of funding well below the FC approved total budgets, re-allocating resources from agreed activities in signed contracts to new priorities that need more resources is very difficult – there is serious competition within each CRP for those resources. Even if there is good capacity and a good approved gender strategy within a CRP, there are inadequate resources to implement it in most CRPs.
- Some CRPs have low capacity in the gender research area and are struggling to build this up on their own.

The Consortium proposes a temporary Gender Performance Scheme to support and accelerate the mainstreaming described above. We believe the primary effect will be that the total volume of good gender research will increase immediately – implementing the approved gender strategies. We already see the incentives built into the Scheme to reward cross-program cooperation are having this effect: CRPs are planning gender research together, setting up joint training and sharing gender analysis methods. So the expectation of participating in the Scheme is promoting cooperation between those CRPs that have strength in a given aspect with other CRPs that can benefit – for example, in defining shared standards for collection of sex-disaggregated data. We also believe that giving some extra resources to those that are ready now, is an incentive for others to catch up. And while the large majority (85%) of the \$5M we propose in 2013 will be allocated as a W1 top-up to those CRPs that are ready to do impactful gender research (based on their approved gender strategy and regular program of work and budget - no extra proposals or reports), we have also proposed some gender capacity building to help the currently substandard programs catch up.

4. How will the scheme fit within the wider strategy and budget for supporting and promoting gender research beyond the three year period proposed by the Scheme?

The Scheme will operate on the basis of ensuring through due diligence (review and approval of gender strategies) that best practice is followed in all CRPs – with a clear path forward in each CRP as to how this will occur (as described in the gender strategies – and monitored through the CRP annual program of work and budget, plus CRP annual report). We are in the middle of a process to ask all CRPs to revise and enhance their gender outcomes (the IDO process) – which will include gendered indicators and targets at all levels. The gender integration will be fully integrated into the Guidance for the CRP 2nd Call (depending on the decision to synchronize, to be discussed at FC9) and will therefore, in future, not depend on special allocations. As noted above, the synchronization decision may move forward the opportunity to mainstream gender research full in all new CRP contracts and obviate the need for the third year of the Scheme.

- 5. Support for gender should come from all CRP donors, whether their resources flow through Window 1, Window 2, or both. Limiting the funding for advancing gender to Window 1 misses the opportunity to utilize and build on all CRP resources.**

Agreed that support for gender should come from all donors. The bulk of the gender research (currently \$58 million programmed) comes from all sources as part of the regular funding of all CRPs. The only source of pooled funding available for Fund Council allocation is Window 1. Window 1 is therefore the only source available to the FC / Consortium for actions to prioritize or incentivize implementation of SRF priorities beyond what is already contained in the approved CRP proposals.

- 6. Gender capacity development: Costs associated with budgets for capacity development: are there funds allocated elsewhere within the Consortium or CRP budgets for gender capacity building? The Scheme currently seems to address capacity building primarily through the collaborative activities. The structure of the Scheme seems to favour already strong performers that invest in these areas (e.g. criteria iii in Annex 1). If this Scheme is the primary mechanism through which capacity building needs will be addressed, a risk still remains that weaker CRPs may not have the opportunity to access additional resources.**

CRPs have allocated \$2.1m to capacity development in three-way partnerships for gender research in the POWB gender budgets. There are no other funds for capacity development in gender in the CO budget. The Consortium has initiated the process to develop a Consortium-wide Capacity Strengthening Strategy, with the intent of similar mainstreaming of capacity strengthening in CRPs as discussed here for gender research. The Consortium will determine the most effective manner to implement the gender capacity development activities in the Scheme (through the Gender and Agriculture Network, through CRPs, collaboratively, or through an external provider – or a combination of these).

- 7. Is the allocation for the Senior Gender Advisor related to the position's salary or are they additional funds and for what purpose? We would consider it appropriate to maintain the salary for the Senior Gender Advisor within the Consortium Office's budget and not be subject to separate funding under a temporary mechanism.**

Yes, the allocation is for the costs of the Senior Gender Advisor, which was established as a temporary position through a consultancy contract. We combined the costs of the Senior Gender Advisor with that of the Scheme as implementing the Scheme was expected to be the primary task of the Advisor in 2013-14. Whether the Consortium Office needs to maintain a Gender Advisor position after gender research has been mainstreamed will be reconsidered at that time.