



Fund

Fund Council

12th Meeting (FC12)—Brussels, Belgium
November 4-5, 2014

WORKING DOCUMENT

Consortium Response (14 July 2014)

Submitted by:
Consortium Office



14 July 2014

Dear Bruce and Ruben,

Please find attached reports from the Consortium Office and the ISPC on your extension proposal. We recognize that the production of the extension proposal represented a large amount of work and think it appropriate that I briefly summarise the process that we adopted to review and assess your proposal. The Consortium Science Team independently evaluated each of the 15 extension proposals received and scored them based on the criteria established under the Extension Call guidelines. These are summarized below:

- Conceptual clarity, innovative thinking, scientific quality.
- Coherence of the proposed program and internal coherence of the set of activities within it.
- Coherence of the program and its sets of activities at portfolio level: is the CRP is working effectively with other CRPs, so there are no unplanned redundancies or gaps in the portfolio level research agenda.
- Quality and relevance of the IDOs proposed and of their indicators and targets- feasibility and credibility of the measures of progress proposed by the CRP.
- Relevance of these sets of activities to the SLOs and the CRP's IDOs.

The process involved a full week of face-to-face review meetings in Montpellier (23rd to 27th June 2014) and involved the full Science Team represented by myself, Anne-Marie Izac, Philippe Ellul, Anita Regmi, Jacqui Ashby, Luis Solorzano and Marie de Lattre-Gasquet. On the 2nd of July we received reports from the ISPC on each of the CRP extension proposals. We reviewed these comments alongside our own independent assessments and subsequently integrated substantial and substantiated comments from the ISPC with those of the Science Team. Both the Science Team and ISPC commentaries are attached for your perusal. You will see that even though the ISPC commentary is written from a somewhat different perspective, there is a high level of congruence between the ISPC's comments and our assessments.

I also attach a bibliometric analysis of CRP publication and citation data mainly in the period 2011-2013. This is for your information and did **not** form part of the evaluation process but is likely to receive greater attention in future, I shall be writing to you separately on this matter.

We considered your extension proposal as excellent; it does not need to be amended prior to submission to the Consortium Board. However, we do request you to (i) respond to our comments, as indicated in the attached reports and (ii) provide a performance matrix, as per the attached template. We request these by 25th August 2014.



Consortium

Thus, your response entails no amendments to your proposal; you simply need to indicate how you will address the comments that we and the ISPC have made. The performance matrix is a requirement from the CGIAR Fund, and is for accountability reasons. It is thus important that you consider it very seriously, as it will be part of your extension contract.

Upon checking that you have addressed all substantive comments and prepared a credible performance matrix, we will submit your original proposal, response and matrix to the Consortium Board and upon their approval to the Fund Council. A formal decision will be made by the Fund Council in November 2014.

We trust that you will find our evaluation and that of the ISPC helpful and we look forward to engaging positively with you and your partners in further advancing the CGIAR research portfolio.

Best wishes,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wayne Powell", is written in a cursive style.

Wayne Powell

Chief Science Officer