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Introduction

In this second phase of consultation on the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF), stakeholders were given the opportunity to consider and provide feedback and ideas on how the whole SRF has been revised and is now articulated. This phase of consultation asked people to consider:

“How well does the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework now reflect a good roadmap for effective agricultural research for development?”

Opportunities to participate in this Phase included the following:

- submit any responses via email to partnerships@CGIAR.ORG
- have your say and also comment on what others have to say in the ‘public chat room’
- Join a webinar in the ‘Call-In Program’ series – where you can discuss ‘in person’ with other stakeholders and some of those involved in developing the SRF [Note-only 20 seats per webinar and sign up required]

Stakeholder feedback from this second Phase will be used to strengthen the SRF before it goes to the Consortium Board for approval on March 23rd 2015, and then on to the Fund Council for Approval in April 2015.

The webinar series- styled as ‘Call-in Programs’ was one of the channels available for people to participate in the second phase of the consultation on the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework. Each webinar focused on a topic in the SRF which received a lot of discussion in the first round and has had subsequent revision. The list, schedule and description of each program can be found below. They were each hosted by some key individuals related to the topics from both inside and outside of CGIAR. To join one or more of the session stakeholders were asked to use an electronic sign-up form to be allocated on of the limited (up to 20) spaces available in each webinar session.

‘Call-in program’ descriptions

1. Looking at the Results Framework in the SRF. Wednesday 11th February 2015

Join in a discussion on the results framework and the SLOs, IDOs, and sub-IDOs that have been articulated as part of this. Together with other stakeholders we invite you to look at how these best provide a strategy for CGIAR over the next ten years. You can find the Results Framework in section 5 starting on page 16 in the current version of the SRF. This session will be hosted by Dr. Maggie Gill – Chair of the Independent Science and Partnership Council.

2. Discussing capacity development in the SRF. Thursday 12th February 2015

Join in a discussion on how capacity development has been included in this new version of the SRF. We invite you to discuss with others how capacity development has been captured towards making the SRF an effective guidance for our work. You can find sections on capacity development on pages 28 and 40 in the current version of the SRF. This session will be hosted by Iman El-Kaffass – Capacity Development Expert, Globtronique Inc.
3. Examining gender in the SRF. Tuesday 17th February 2015

Join in a discussion on how gender features in the SRF and how best it can be reflected in this strategy for the next ten years for CGIAR work. Find gender throughout the SRF but particular sections can be found on pages 27, 31. This session will be hosted by Jaqueline Ashby – Senior Advisor, Gender and Research, Consortium Office.

4. Exploring partnership for impact in the SRF. Wednesday 18th February 2015

Join in a discussion on how partnering and partnerships for impact is reflected in the revised version of the SRF. Share views on how this can be strengthened to make the SRF an effective roadmap for agricultural research for development. This topic can be found throughout the SRF and particularly in a section on pages 38-41 of the current version of the SRF. This session will be hosted by Alain Vidal – Consortium Office.

5. Gathering youth perspectives on/for the SRF. Thursday 19th February 2015

If you are a young person (under 40) or someone interested in the role of the youth who wants to share your perspective and ideas on how the SRF can be an effective roadmap for agricultural research for development-then join this session. This session will be hosted by Courtney Paisley – YPARD.

6. Looking at the research domains in the SRF. Wednesday 25th February 2015

Join in a discussion on the Research Strategy in the SRF which are now conceived as “priority research areas and comparative advantages of the CGIAR”. This section in the SRF outlines the principles that guide CGIAR’s strategy and the selection of priority research areas for inclusion in center and consortium-level programs and can be found in section 6 starting on page 30 in the current version of the SRF. This session will be hosted by Wayne Powell – CGIAR Consortium Office.

Each session was recorded and a summary provided by the host of each session. These are available on the SRF Consultation Results page found at: http://www.cgiar.org/srfconsultation/srf-consultation-results/

A narrative of each session was also captured by Fiona Chandler (GFAR). The compiled results of this channel can be found below.

1. Webinar on the Results Framework of the SRF

Date: Wednesday 11th February 2015

Summary by host– Maggie Gill, ISPC
- There was generally positive feedback on the latest version of the SRF including comments such as it had ‘matured’ or ‘evolved’ in a good direction. The increased profile for cross-cutting themes was welcomed.
• On specific feedback to the writing team, there was a feeling that more should be said about how the cross-cutting themes and partnership strategies would be implemented (e.g. through planned activities/strategies being included and assessed as part of each CRP proposal).

• There was also a very specific concern raised that the last sentence on p 20 of the latest version could be interpreted as implying a linear progression from research results to outcomes – perhaps it could be reworded to avoid this?

• There was a discussion on targets and the ‘host’ reported from the discussions in Berne that these would be quantified in each CRP proposal and the ISPC (+others) would consider how the sum of all targets might be set at the System level, taking due account of trade-offs between IDOs. The point was also made that some of the IDOs are included in the RF to ensure that unintended consequences are not ignored in setting research agendas, rather than expecting that the CGIAR could make a significant contribution to that particular IDO during the lifetime of this SRF.

• There were a number of specific questions about implementation and the host clarified that it would be inappropriate to go into detail (e.g. on % of funding to be allocated to partners) in a strategy document that was expected to have a validity of 10 years, but that these details were under active consideration as part of the Guidance for the 2nd call for CRPs.

Full notes

This is first of the webinar series for consultation on CGIAR’s Strategy and Results Framework – a key element in the GCARD process. In this first webinar Dr. Maggie Gill, Chair of the Chair of the Independent Science and Partnership Council, hosted a discussion on the Results Framework in the SRF and how the results framework together with the SLOs, IDOs, and sub-IDOs, best provide a strategy for CGIAR over the next ten years.

After welcoming the participants to the webinar, Maggie gave a short summary of the SRF development process and the extensive consultation that had taken place over the past 6 months to bring it to shape it is now in. As Maggie pointed out “the aim of today is to get feedback on how it looks now. We will be welcoming comments on the wording as well as the text in the document associated with the IDOs and sub-IDOs.”

Comment #1: Overall impression is that the RF has matured over time and reflects current thinking. The questions remains on how will this be implemented and how will we be organized to achieve this? The SRF is informed by external influences and so how is CGIAR going to lead the implementation?

Comment #2 (Iman El-Kaffass): How do the vision and mission flow down; is the results framework fitting in with other parts of the SRF; do the priority research areas match the RF [this is paraphrasing Nadia as the sound wasn’t good enough to capture verbatim her comments]

Comment #3: Endorsement of the previous comment and encouraging seeing the evolution of the SRF document. From a social scientists perspective it is good to see inclusion of poor rural women built into the strategy. The SRF has evolved to integrate that issue much more incisively. What would be helpful is for those interested in the cross cutting issues to get a sense of how CGIAR sees these issues being built into the next round of CRP proposals. Will every proposal be invited to include a cross cutting issue? Will there be focused proposals on cross cutting issues?

Comment #4: Happy with the evolution of the document and the inclusion of the cross cutting issues. However, is the SRF bold enough? Currently it is “contributing, reducing [poverty] –should it be bolder and refer to “eradicating” which would bring it more in line with SDGs.
Will numbers be included in the SRF e.g. number of people out of poverty etc.? The CGIAR system should be saying what it will be delivering – as a system.

Comment #5: Particularly pleased to see cross cutting issues as IDOs included in the SRF. This sends strong signals about building an enabling environment. Reference to Results Based Management (RBM) is also welcomed. However, what are the next steps in developing the RBM – who takes it forward – what about the targets and indicators (probably not realistic for every IDO and sub-IDO)? There still seems to have more work to do on this – how will this go forward?

Response from Maggie:
It is good to hear the positive comments. To clarify the process – the Consortium Office is taking the next steps in considering all comments and input arising from the consultation. This will be made available to the Consortium Board and then to the Fund Council in relation to the final approval of the SRF in April/May.

To be honest, the SRF writing team didn’t have time to get everything into the document that was raised in the Bern meeting. Additional boxes will be added that will indicate targets from past CGIAR research and what that has led to. No targets have been set for the future because we don’t know what countries CRPs will be working in and what research will be done. To do this was considered as driving the agenda from the top. Much of the prioritization and targeting will be done during the preparation and evaluation of the CRP proposals (first phase call in May). When looking at those proposals, the reviewers (ISPC and external) will look at the targets and how they relate to the sub-IDOs and whether some sub-IDOs are not as well addressed. They will also look at what others outside of the CGIAR are doing. Together these will give a better idea of how these add up over time to deliver on the IDOs.

I believe that the vision and mission as currently written are an improvement. In the mission statement CGIAR is being more definite on what it can deliver. The IDOs and sub-IDOs add “flesh on the bones”. In the assessment on the CRP proposals, the review will be looking at how strong and genuine are the partnerships and is there evidence that partnerships can deliver at the higher levels. The assessment criteria for the proposals are being developed. Gender is one of the criteria that will need to be addressed as well as the other cross cutting issues.

I feel that the SRF has gone as far as it can go in terms of boldness. RBM will kick in when targets are set in the CRPs. The challenge will be to see that they are stretched enough.

Priority research areas are informing CRPs of what is needed to deliver on the SRF.

Comment #6: How will the ISPC deal with trade-offs? Being driven by targets and numbers is dangerous – this might arise in selection bias of working with what we know and what we have proven.

Response from Maggie: The ISPC is opposed to quantification of research. We should expect unpredictability in the life of the SRF. When looking at CRPs, the ISPC will be seeing that the proposals make the case on whether they deliver. The proposals need to have taken the RF onboard. CRPs will set the targets and they will be used for RBM. Targets are not a method for prioritization between CRPs (at least not by the ISPC).

Comment #7: The current wording of the SRF on cross cutting issues and partnerships need further elaboration in the SRF as it currently does not say how these issues will be addressed.
Comment #8: Only 2 of the cross cutting areas are included in the priority research areas. Why is capacity building not included? Can more guidance be given on what the CGIAR will offer on capacity development?

Response from Maggie: My understanding is that capacity development, as discussed in previous consultations, is more in line with organizational CD in order to deliver. If CD has a research component it should be included in the research area of enabling policies and institutions. I agree that there should be more wording and clarify of CD and partnership in the SRF.

Comment #9: My opinion is that the writing team should be operating under the oversight of the Consortium Office so as to take into account some of the leadership decisions regarding, as an example, how much ‘blue sky research’ should be included; how much funds go to partners. This is the sort of information that has to come from the Consortium – not just the writing team.

Response from Maggie: This is a 10 year document. The world will change a lot over those years and we are starting off with not knowing how much money funders will want, or be able, to give. Our system is dependent on funding. I would discourage percentages being put into the SRF. However, the guidance document for CRP has some space for this and is being led by Consortium’s CEO, in consultation with Fund Council. This sort of input is more appropriate in the guidance note than the SRF.

Comment #10: Can’t see a difference between SLO on Improved food and nutrition security for health and the IDO on improved human and animal health through better agricultural practices. More information and clarity is required as well as how this could be measured.

Response from Maggie: In my view the SLO is more about security whereas the IDO is on health. The IDO is quite a bit smaller and more focused than SLO. It is most likely that the CGIAR contribution in this will not be huge but it should be significant.

Comment #11: I’d like to come back to IDOs and what CRPs will put in their proposals and working in the RBM system. Will there be ‘hard’ accountability IDOs (bell weathers of overall CRP performance that lend themselves to quantification and comparison)? Other IDOs are more intended to get researchers to think about in creating an enabling environment and to show progress towards those without being tied to a set of targets learning. There would be two types of IDOs – learning IDOs and accountability IDOs.

Response from Maggie: If we take research towards SLO2, as an example, which has been funded for up to 20 years. There are now results being taken into practice and contributing to targets. On the other hand there is other research in A4NH that is farther from that sort of level. This is a good point to make - which IDOs the CGIAR will really deliver on over the course of the SRF. SPIA has knowledge on how to measure target and the tradeoffs.

Comment #12: There is a statement on page 20 of the SRF about CGIAR research outputs which, when taken up by farmers or development partners, could contribute to each SLO. I would question on whether this is this the way it is meant to be – it looks quite linear e.g. research is done and then fed into the development process? It leaves us with the idea that the research is produced and then there is a wait for farmers to take it up. This should be written to avoid this perception.

Response from Maggie: In the rewriting, the text should reflect on how CGIAR works with partners to deliver research outputs.

Response from Maggie: I agree with the intention as described in this comment. Certainly CGIAR is not giving directly to farmers – there are development and intermediary actors who are also involved. This suggestion for clarification should be addressed.
Maggie’s closing remarks: Thanks to all of you who have contributed today. I enjoyed learning how differently we can perceive the ways things are written. The comments have proved very helpful in having a clearer idea of what CGIAR can do. I’m comforted that the SRF is progressing along the right lines. The comments and ideas for the Guidance of CRPs and overall implementation that have been given today are very useful and will be circulated to the group working on these guidelines. We are not staring afresh; there will be research outcomes coming from current CRPs that are built upon in the next round of CRPs.

Thank you very much.

2. Webinar on Capacity Development in the SRF

Date: Thursday 12th February 2015

Summary by Host- Iman El-Kafass, Capacity Development Expert, Globtronique Inc.

- There is agreement that there has been change in the approach to CD seen in some sections
- Yet, the coherence of the document with regard to its different mentions of CD needs to be worked on. There is a need for a clear definition of what is covered by the term to remove present confusions.
- There is a need to define clearly and re-scope what we mean in the document by CD – there are both broad and restrictive mentions in the document – so consistency again is needed
- The need to realign CD with the change in CGIAR that is described in the SRF and to detach it from the old way of doing things: what approaches, tools, processes, partnerships (new-current) are needed in the coming years.
- An agreement on Peter Matlon’s quote on page 40 - this could lead the review of the sections on CD – the importance of developing the capacities of our partners to lead research and development
- The importance of developing capacities of future leaders – men and women to lead research and development in their countries and regions
- The great value of developing capacity to innovate and the importance of including this explicitly and consolidate mentions in the document to read as “develop systems capacity to innovate” rather than capacity to innovate of individuals/partners, etc
- The “HOW” needs to be elaborated – the modus operandi as mentioned – the pathway to follow from the “What to do” – the stated outcomes of CD - to “how to do it” and how to assess results and check that we reached our goals and targeted outcomes in CD
- The need to define what CGIAR can do directly and what it can partner to do and contribute to in the area of CD
· We should define our partners and beneficiaries more and expand the scope of both to include higher education, farmers, underprivileged producers and consumers while mentioning the how of addressing their capacity needs

· The need to be clear on our vision of success in 10 years. What will be achieved and how the process will be implemented – What would CGIAR and its CD look like in 10 years and what are the implications for the role of national systems as programme leaders and of the future CGIAR?

· The importance of consolidating funding for CD of national systems to ensure consistency and ability to partner the CGIAR’s programmes

· Research on capacity development should be one of CGIAR research priorities similar to gender and policies and institutions especially as we are embarking on developing capacities to innovate, on handling resistance to change and on measuring our performance in CD. Research results should be captured and used in improving our approach to CD.

· We need to always consider our own evolution and the evolution of our partners as change is ongoing at both sides and this should reflect on our partnerships. So CGIAR should adapt its internal organization and develop its capacities to partner to reflect the changes in the environment.

· We should assess CD value in achieving impact at scale which is the target of CGIAR and include it as an intermediate development objective of the work of CGIAR

· There is still linearity in thinking that needs to be replaced by a comprehensive holistic and integrative view of capacity development where there is real interaction between partners; south-south; south-north and on aspects of individual, institutional and organizational CD.

· We should link with the G20 initiatives especially with regard what concerns the leadership of our partners.

Specific comments on SRF text:

· Call for two additional paragraphs on page 40: more explicitly how can the CD work for strengthening partners -modus operandi - and another paragraph on how the CG can adapt its capabilities in its organization to develop alliance capabilities.

· In page 15. Strengthening research capacities: empower national partners to lead research efforts, should go beyond that to delegate to partners leading research efforts.

· There is inconsistency on page 40 – it indicates that somewhere already the CG has been able to define the issues that partner organizations are concerned about.

· On page 40. We need to mention what the 9 points of the CD Framework are

**Full Notes**

This is second of the webinar series providing a further opportunity to comment on CGIAR’s Strategy and Results Framework – one of the consultations that are included in the GCARD process. In this second webinar Iman El-Kaffass, hosted a discussion on how capacity development has been captured in the SRF and does this provide an effective guidance for CGIAR’s work.
After welcoming the participants to the webinar, Iman expressed her pleasure at the interest shown on the topic and the participation by such a wide diversity of sectors. She outlined the areas in the SRF where capacity development is mentioned and then invited participants to respond to the main question posed “how capacity development has been captured in the SRF and does this provide an effective guidance for CGIAR’s work”.

Comment #1: Appreciate the opportunity to contribute again to shaping this organic document that has reflected the capacity development consultations. After 23 years in the CGIAR, I was pleased because it seems that change is going on in the way research is being done. However, when getting to the capacity development section there seems to be a disconnect with the rest of the document. Need to reflect on the section on the niche and ask the question on “what’s new” in how capacity development can support the delivery of these questions. What new technologies, what new process and partnering skills are needed? There needs to be a better link between capacity development and Research Priority Areas and Results Framework and to show how capacity development is reflected in these.

On Figure 2 (cross cutting issues), the description of capacity development is bolder, broader and all encompassing. However, in the section (page 40) the text is more restricted and sounds more internal in focus.

Capacity development is actually in all cross cutting areas. What are the links between capacity development as a cross cutting issue in itself and how it links to the other cross cutting issues (climate change, gender and youth, policies and institutions)?

Capacity development is not tied enough into the system. What is capacity developments strategic role in delivering? The capacity development and partnership section need to go hand in hand – and yet, at the moment, these don’t complement each other. Peter Matlon’s quote (page 40) indicates that capacity development needs to go much beyond taking up CGIAR products but for partners to lead and implement in whatever ways are appropriate. If this is the case the section on page 40 doesn’t meet the challenge.

Comment #2: Picking up from last comment, I share these views. Focusing on page 40 of the SRF there is a disconnect and inconsistency in the text between CGIAR, on one hand “concentrating on capacity development that is more narrowly related to the conduct of applied research” and capacity development being a strategic enabler for CGIAR and cutting across multiple levels, individual, organizational and institution.

The “how” do to this is not explained in the document. I would make a suggestion to add two additional paragraphs on capacity development making (1) it more explicit on how CGIAR can develop capacity development in organizations and (2) how CGIAR can adapt its alliance capabilities and work better with others.

The focus should be in, not so much strengthening research capacity so as to empower national partners to lead research efforts, but more to delegate to partners, so that national partners have responsibility arising from capacity development e.g. give them leadership on some components on CRPs.

Comment #3: Pleased to see that in the SRF, capacity development goes beyond building research capacity to research capacity to innovate. This is fitting with the outcome focus of the SRF because the way research has impact is through catalyzing and supporting innovation trajectories. Therefore building capacity to innovate and having that as a sub IDO on CRP impact pathways, makes sense. In regards to the ‘how’ we do this, the capacity to innovate provides some direction on this. However, this is not reflected well in the text.
expect in Figure 2, and it should do. I recommend that the 2 sub-IDOs on capacity to innovate are put together and called “system capacity to innovate”.

Comment #4: Capacity development needs to go beyond keeping up with research but also for developing young people to lead in the sector. In the end we should be thinking that successful capacity development of institutions and partners should lead to putting the CGIAR out of a job.

Comment #5: The SRF should have a specific mention of working with higher education in developing the next generation of leaders. On top of page 41 the very last sentence should include post graduate capacity development to target the next generation of leaders.

Comment #6: The document needs to be clearer in that capacity development is not just about training. The section on page 40 refers to the nine elements in the Capacity Development Framework but this information is not included in the SRF.

The current framing of capacity development in the SRF seems largely internal document at the moment.

As a strategy framework document there is still no vision of what success will look like for capacity development. What will it have achieved in the next 10 years? Currently it looks more like a wish list than a gut purpose of what CGIAR is for. How will CG evolve its role so that there is more ownership of countries to do their own thing? This should be the goal for capacity development in the document.

Greater links should be made between partnership and capacity development and move away from some of the linearity of thinking that is still reflected in the document. Furthermore, capacity development is not yet woven into the research strategies. More work needs to be done to tie these together.

The text at the moment doesn’t back up the quote by Peter Matlon. How is CGIAR research enabling partners to do the work and take on the responsibilities by the end of the SRF?

Comment #7: I reiterate similar concerns as other speakers. The document has not recognized that there have been lots of changes on the ground in national systems we want to support – they have evolved, and will continue to evolve – without CGIAR. The SRF needs to include this recognition.

The G20 Capacity Development Framework for Agricultural Innovation Systems should be mentioned in the SRF so CGIAR is not seen as isolated from this and regional operations.

Agree with speaker that not enough is included about capacity to innovate in partner organizations. Need to add clarification on capacity to innovate and have this align with international processes.

On another point, I’m not too sure whether CGIAR can or should go down the route of developing capacity of local actors – that should be done by the national systems. There should be alignment of CGIAR strategy with others that are self-mobilizing.

I agree that the section on capacity development on page 40 is inconsistent and have asked myself if CGIAR has been able to define all the issues that partners are concerned about (or should be) and if this is consistent with partnership strategies.

Comment #8: We are all delighted to see CGIAR moving from individual training/capacity development to a broader definition but the SRF is not clear on concrete actions on how to do this at the organizational and institutional level. There is a need to see how to build strong alliances to do this as CGIAR has no expertise in
Comment #9: Thanks to all the good points made and many are the ones that the capacity development community of practice has been struggling with. I agree with the point that there is a lack of vision of what success would look like for capacity development. There was a strong recommendation from those drafting the SRF that this is a framework and the way it will be implemented will be addressed in the capacity development guidelines which specifically mentions capacity to partner, alliances etc. Perhaps there is a need to look more closely at these guidelines. The SRF doesn’t make enough reference to the guidelines.

I agree on linking capacity development and partnerships. To elaborate, the Fund Council thinks partnerships are for resource mobilization. This is not the way Consortium sees partnerships, which is more about taking results of research to scale.

Comment #10: I echo the observations on the coherence of the document as it currently stands. This could stem from a lack of clarity among ourselves on what we mean by capacity development. I see a potential brand risk (on which is primarily an externally focused document) that we over-promise and under-deliver. There is a need to re-scope what we mean by capacity development and be sharper in the SRF on what we mean by capacity development. I sense that without some of this clarity we may put ourselves at risk.

We need to be honest among ourselves if we have the competency and capacity to do this level of capacity development ourselves without changing ourselves in the process.

Comment #11: A common understanding of capacity development will help the document.

Comment #12: By and large, one can be delighted with the process that has evolved around capacity development in the current SRF – it is far more holistic than it was previously. Now that capacity development has been recognized at the IDO and sub-IDO level it will prompt looking in more detail at specific indicators and how they align across the whole system. I suggest giving thought to these and tweaking before the SRF is finalized.

Response from Iman:

When the 2nd call for CRP proposals comes out there will need to be a capacity development strategy. Will what is in the SRF now (and with additional input) be enough guidance for CRPs?

Do we see other beneficiaries of capacity development other than the partners of research? Could it be farmers, universities, producers, consumers – do we agree on these partners? What type of partnership is needed? What technologies and tools are needed now?

In the nine points (which should be included), research on capacity development should be included e.g. addressing resistance to change in capacity development; role of capacity development in achieving impact at scale.

Comment #13: The extent of how CGIAR should be resourcing capacity development, and the roles of others, could be better elaborated in the SRF. Can more be added on how the power of the system can help mobilize support from national systems to take up capacity development in their own systems?

Comment #14: The money question is left begging in the SRF. There is language in the partnership section on this aspect and so why not have it in regards to the capacity development section as well? This would give the SRF much more clout.
Research on capacity development has been talked about a lot. Gender and Inclusion as well as Enabling Policies and institutions (both cross cutting issues) are mentioned in the research areas. Capacity development should also be included as a research area in its own right e.g. building on the ILAC experience and channeling this back into the capacity development process. The text on page 40, and the guidelines themselves (instructions for CRPs), should take this up and be stronger in having research on capacity development. More on new technologies would be valuable.

Comment #15: The question on whether capacity development should be an IDO has often been raised with the argument being that capacity development is on the impact pathway to IDO and so shouldn’t be an IDO or sub-IDO. There is a need to be go beyond technical capacity to building system capacity (capacity to partner, capacity to work in different ways) and that brings it to the IDO level.

Perhaps an opportunity for research on capacity development in regards to the research on progress of CRP along their pathways of change.

Comment #16: The question on whether capacity development should be an IDO has come up repeatedly. This is a profound issue and we need to ensure that the wording is strengthened – as an objective of CGIAR itself.

Comment #17: I can understand the issue of capacity development as an IDO. A couple of ending points...CGIAR should be specific on where it wants to invest in capacity development and currently the definition of partners of there to scale up CGIAR research is too narrow.

Summary points by Iman:
- There is agreement that there has been change in the approach to capacity development seen in some sections
- The coherence of the document with regard to its different mentions of capacity development needs to be worked on
- There is a need to define clearly and rescope what we mean in the document by capacity development – there are both broad and restrictive mentions in the document – so consistency again is needed
- The need to realign capacity development with the change in CGIAR that is described in the SRF and to detach it from the old way of doing things: what approaches, tools, processes, partnerships (new-current) are needed in the coming years.
- An agreement on Peter Matlon’s quote on page 40 - this could lead the review of the sections on capacity development – the importance of developing the capacities of our partners to lead research and development
- The importance of developing capacities of future leaders – men and women to lead research and development in their countries and regions
- The great value of developing capacity to innovate and the importance of including this explicitly and consolidate mentions in the document to read as “develop systems capacity to innovate” rather than capacity to innovate of individuals/partners, etc
- The “HOW” needs to be elaborated – the modus operandi as mentioned – the pathway to follow from the “What to do” – the stated outcomes of capacity development - to “how to do it” and how to assess results and check that we reached our goals and targeted outcomes in capacity development
- The need to define what CGIAR can do directly and what it can partner to do and contribute to in the area of capacity development
- We should define our partners and beneficiaries more and expand the scope of both to include higher education, farmers, underprivileged producers and consumers while mentioning the how of addressing their capacity needs
• The need to be clear on our vision of success in 10 years. What will be achieved and how the process will be implemented – What would CGIAR and its capacity development look like in 10 years
• The importance of consolidating funding for capacity development to ensure consistency
• Research on capacity development should be one of CGIAR research priorities similar to gender and policies and institutions especially as we are embarking on developing capacities to innovate, on handling resistance to change and on measuring our performance in capacity development. Research results should be captured and used in improving our approach to capacity development.
• We need to always consider our own evolution and the evolution of our partners as change is ongoing at both sides and this should reflect on our partnerships. So CGIAR should adapt its internal organization and develop its capacities to partner to reflect the changes in the environment.
• We should assess capacity development value in achieving impact at scale which is the target of CGIAR and include it as an intermediate development objective of the work of CGIAR
• There is still linearity in thinking that needs to be replaced by a comprehensive holistic and integrative view of capacity development where there is real interaction between partners; south-south; south-north and on aspects of individual, institutional and organizational capacity development.
• We need to always consider our own evolution and the evolution of our partners as change is ongoing at both sides and this should reflect on our partnerships. So CGIAR should adapt its internal organization and develop its capacities to partner to reflect the changes in the environment.
• We should assess capacity development value in achieving impact at scale which is the target of CGIAR and include it as an intermediate development objective of the work of CGIAR
• There is still linearity in thinking that needs to be replaced by a comprehensive holistic and integrative view of capacity development where there is real interaction between partners; south-south; south-north and on aspects of individual, institutional and organizational capacity development.
• We should link with the G20 initiatives especially with regard what concerns the leadership of our partners.

Specific comments on SRF text:
• Call for two additional paragraphs on page 40: more explicitly how can the capacity development work for strengthening partners -modus operandi - and another paragraph on how the CG can adapt its capabilities in its organization to develop alliance capabilities.
• In page 15. Strengthening research capacities: empower national partners to lead research efforts, should go beyond that to delegate to partners leading research efforts.
• There is inconsistency on page 40 – it indicates that somewhere already the CG has been able to define the issues that partner organizations are concerned about.
• On page 40. We need to mention the 9 points of the capacity development Framework
• Personally enjoyed the flow of information and knowledge.

Thank you very much.

3. Webinar on gender in the SRF

Date: Tuesday 17th February 2015

Summary by host- Jaqueline Ashby, Senior Advisor, Gender and Research, Consortium Office

• There was generally a positive view of the progress the SRF has taken in the latest version; gender now has its own IDO (again) and three supportive sub-IDOs. The latest version is more aligned with what the CGIAR Gender and Agriculture Research Network recommended through a Memo in May 2014.1
• When discussion came to how the SRF can be an effective roadmap for CGIAR in the upcoming years in terms of gender the focus were mainly around three topics:
  o Gender relations need to be addressed, not just women: The issue of women is integrated well in the current version, but gender concerns more than women – it concerns the

1 http://library.cgiar.org/handle/10947/3171
relationships between men and women, and particular within households when it comes to agriculture. The difference in roles in agriculture of men and women need more emphasis in order to reach the outcomes identified. Inclusion is a useful approach.

- **Gender needs a more prominent place in the document**: There was some concern expressed about the main Results Framework is presented on page 17 while the cross-cutting issues Results Framework is visualized much later in the document on page 29. Being a cross-cutting issue and given a lower (later) level of attention sends a message “this is something that we deal with later”. Everything done within the CGIAR affects roles of men and women so the question is not “if” but “how” whether we do gender-blind research or we have a strategy for being gender-responsive. We need to make sure the effort leads to a positive impact. This is more important than a “later cross-cutting” issue.

- **Gender and Youth bulked together is not helpful**: Concerns were being raised about grouping Gender and Youth as if they are one group research can cater to altogether. Gender inclusiveness and inclusiveness of youth require very different approaches. There is a risk of doubling the work load, alternatively diluting both issues. At the same time as it is understood this is a harmonization with the United Nation Sustainable Development Goals and important it is still questioned if this is the best way to do it.

- The group also recognized the importance of the SRF and how well gender is presented; for stakeholders, gender researchers and non-social scientists to enhance their work, and also for successful CRP Second Call Proposals later coming up.

### Full Notes

This is the third of the webinar series providing a further opportunity to comment on CGIAR’s Strategy and Results Framework – one of the consultations that are part of the overall GCARD process.

In this third webinar Jacqui Ashby from the CGIAR Consortium Office, hosted a discussion on how gender features in the SRF and how best it can be reflected in this strategy for the next ten years for CGIAR work.

After welcoming the participants to the webinar, Jacqui gave a short introduction on the topic. She noted how the current SRF document reflects an evolution in CGIAR thinking and gives gender equity a much heightened importance compared to past versions. The vision goes beyond growth in food supply to a focus on development of diverse agricultural systems, the efficiency of resource use within them and a greater importance on gender equity. The promotion of gender equity is one of the principles guiding CGIAR research and is fundamental to achieving the CGIAR goals. Gender and youth is a cross cutting issue and gender and inclusive growth is a research priority area. As a cross cutting issue there are three expected outcomes: Gender-equitable control of productive assets and resources; Technologies that save time and energy developed and disseminated; Improved capacity of women and young people to participate in decision-making. The first and last ones have been discussed and formulated as indicators for the IDO on gender by a Committee formed by the Gender network and received a fair amount of discussions and analysis by the gender community.

So the framework proposes that these three outcomes will contribute to the poverty and growth (Productivity growth through inclusion and diversification of household income); contribute to food security (through diversification of household income and women spending more on children’s nutrition) and NRM (better stewardship when women have power and more options to reduce pressure on resources).
So, to start our discussion we are asked to frame responses around the general question of how well does the SRF provides a good roadmap for effective agricultural research development. And also to hear from you on how well this strategy addresses gender in research.

Comment #1: It's great to see CGIAR focusing on gender equity and especially young people but my question is where the men in this picture are? To achieve the great objectives as outline in the SRF will also require education of men.

Comment #2: I agree that it is important to keep on highlighting men. Other points I wanted to bring up is that I am concerned about putting youth and gender together. Youth is important but will it raise expectations on doubling the amount of work for the same amount of funding? Approaches in each of these areas are quite different so we need to be careful about putting these two together. My other concern is that cross cutting issues don’t appear until quite far in the SRF (page 27) which means that people look at it later in the document. Can it be brought forward in the SRF and closer with the IDOs?

Another point is that it is great to have gender in line with climate change and policies/institutions as research priority areas. This is a good result.

Is there any way we make sure that in the SRF it is clear that a gender analysis on the problem statements that the CRPs have looked at has been done. This should be put up as a problem statement in the SRF.

We are hitting a capacity issue to get people to do the gender research and this will need to be managed.

Comment #3: We are equating gender and women through most of the document – thinking about gender and how gender fits in is more than just including women – there is a need to understand that social relations between men and women affect all of these outcomes. This is not in the SRF very much.

When talking about youth we often think about young men and so need to consider youth as both young men and young women. Part of what we need to do is inclusiveness, making sure we aren’t leaving out categories. We should be not only thinking about marginalized groups including women – yes they do need to be considered but also we need to think that there are lots of women who are not marginalized and who are poised to be able to engage in activities. So we should be thinking about marginalized groups, inclusiveness, including women and youth and gender analysis and thinking we are incorporating gender. These pieces are not really in the document.

An assumption is made that there is better stewardship when women are in power. Need to make a better case of the relationships between woman and men when resources are better managed and not assume women are better caretakers and what conditions are natural resources better managed and the role of women in that.

Comment #4: I am excited that youth are included and hear the argument on cost but feel including youth is a good development. At first I thought that there might be a chance that gender as cross cutting issue could be diluted? Then you see how gender is going to show up in research. What does it really mean that they are both? What can we expect from having it in both? Was it a compromise? What is the strategy behind this?

Response:
The writing and conceptualization of the SRF has entailed a huge committee of people who have provided input. However, not all of this has been taken into account. So it is important that the points being made here are further disseminated. One of the challenges has been that the ISPC doesn’t have any gender specialists. The whole cross cutting issue comes from the donors as much from the ISPC and the SRF writers.
There has been a lot of work to get gender as an IDO and a position in the RF. But for some reason it also has maintained a role as a cross cutting issue. We need to reiterate the concern that gender more than 'gettin to it later". There is enough emphasis and good practice on gender in the CRPs (due to gender strategies and gender budgeting and importance of gender in the 2nd call) so difficult for gender to evaporate.

The people who write the document don’t pay attention to the difference between women, sex disaggregation and gender relations. This alerts us that we need to get the point across that this is a much more complex set of relationships than just distinguish farmers in the field by whether they are wearing a skirt or not. View the document as a living document/process that we in the gender research community still have a lot of work to do to get the fundamental tenets of the approach across to those that are formulating these documents and strategies. We have been able to have a voice – things have progressed – we have gone beyond just including women. However, these are things we need to communicate repeatedly and consistently to everyone involved in writing these documents.

Agree that it is not helpful to put gender and youth together – the processes going on e.g. migration, situation of young people in rural areas – are such different processes and need different interventions. I think we may have to live with this at the moment. But perhaps going to the webinar on youth we can reinforce this point that both demographics groups shouldn’t be lumped together.

SRF doesn’t address capacity and this is a serious concern. We’ve put a flag behind these two outcomes – do we have the capacity to deliver? One of the answers we will have to focus our efforts. CRPS has developed their individual strategies and these issues appear in different degrees in each. In the second round of proposals, it will be important to focus effort on these three outcomes. We need to show results. One of the things we are doing with CIAT team is start analyzing, organizing and communicating and clustering the whole body of gender work around the sub-IDOs.

It is extremely important that the points that have been raised in the session because this helps drive it home to the SRF team.

Comment #5: Is this strategy realistic in terms of gender? Are we promising to deliver beyond capacity? Is this a realistic set of objectives for CGIAR?

Comment #6: Are we positioned as agricultural researchers to dive into these men/women relationships that are so diverse in each country and each culture? Can we really intervene in the roles of women and men so they have equitable control? What can we say if people say we want to change people’s norms?

Comment #7: The simple answer is that everything we do affects the relationships between men and women, particularly within households. The question is do we do this blindly or do we try to take them into account when forming policies? If we are doing any sort of agricultural research and policies we are having an impact on gender relations and we should be making efforts to make sure it is positive and not negative.

Comment #8: Plant breeders are willing to agree that what they do affect women in some way – but then they say it is too complicated, too location specific, too culturally specific for them. I sense that gender researchers are not positioned methodologically to respond to the “so what” issues from breeders? Plant breeders are working in a mega-environment. As social scientists we need to enable and characterize and support biological scientists to work in the social mega environment. Need to put together a bigger picture and that is why measuring the outcomes on a large scale with large data sets might help them. There is still a big discussion going on how to do this.

Comment #9: I don’t think it is a completely a level playing field in the sense that technical scientists have been working on this a long time – social / gender has had less time to work through the methodological
issues. We have a huge challenge and goes back to attitudes on social science in CGIAR. One of things is that we have been fighting for is space for gender research. Large scale tends to be supply led – what about the demand? Talking about demand, allocation is bigger than just gender and we get caught up in this. Bottom line is we need to fight for space to have this thinking and not be expected to have the answers right away. Fight for space to be more gender responsive, we need to figure out where the issues are and where we should focus efforts – this takes time.

Comment #10: As a cross cutting issue, it could argue that gender is mainstreamed and integrated into all the research. Willing to buy into this but practically in terms of having a space to do the research, I’m concerned that people embedded in the commodity research and NRM programs don’t have the space, legitimacy and mandate to do fundamental or strategic gender research. This is going to be a serious problem and might be considered a task rather than a piece of research. This raises the issues, as the second call comes forward for CRPs, do we have a strong enough organizational space to support gender research in CRPs?

Comment #11: Instead of calling it women and youth frame it as inclusiveness and having it inclusive of women, youth and whatever marginalized group. I re-emphasize the issue of capacity. How do we deal with this issue of capacity within CGIAR?

Response: Inclusiveness can be a two edged sword – it can end up in everything lumped together and instead of gender strategy that looks at men and women, CRPs might just pick up ‘marginalized’. Funds get dissipated. Intellectually appealing but could be an escape route and end up finding it difficult to hold programs accountable in terms of what they are spending their money on.

Comment #12: I think there is need to focus on gender relations but instead of youth and women as headings think of about the ways we need to be inclusive of women and youth as well as this broader category of gender relations. We really don’t have the gender relations piece in the SRF yet.

Comment #13: One of the interesting things in the SRF is that there is more emphasis on poverty than I’ve seen in CG documents recently. Poor people will mean poor men and poor women – how can we leverage that into something that makes us more accountable to these people?

Comment #14: Are there structural things we can put in place to actually help the whole agenda? Having gender as an IDO and having the gender strategies are good tools. Are there other tools? Can’t think of anything yet, but can we think of something structural that people will be held accountable?

Comment #15: The SRF is one of these mechanisms as is the Results Framework which will be used in the CRPs. Getting the bits into the SRF can be one of these mechanisms.

Response: The CRP guidance note is another tool that could be used. This could be sent to the gender research coordinators and see what could be added to this to ensure accountability and that integration of gender is included in CRPs. One recommendation was that there was someone on the CRP management team that was informed in the social sciences and that gender was integrated. A joint statement arising from this webinar could help target the guidance of the 2nd call.

Comment #16: In hearing these points, it would be useful and helpful to the writing team to have these issues structured around what you want to see in the SRF. A structured, collective statement would be useful.

Summary:
• One point that stood out clearly was the approach to the issue – having women is there but not gender and gender relations. IDO is about achieving equity – can we make some improvements on how that is conceptualized?
• Still the issues of gender as a cross cutting issue and one of the research priorities and whether that really positions gender at the level of significance that is needed to make the strategy effective.
• Making sure the issues raised are in the guidance for the second call – structural issues and mechanisms for accountability
• We will try and prepare a collective statement once we’ve reviewed the notes of the webinar.

4. Webinar on partnering for impact

Date: Wednesday 18th February 2015

Summary by host-Alain Vidal, Director of Strategy(a.i) and Senior Partnerships Advisor, Consortium Office

4 key new elements

• CGIAR not alone, hence need to partner widely to address tomorrow’s challenges;
• Large coalitions are one of the new ways of addressing this and to involve programs outside CGIAR that are contributing to SRF;
• Shared costs for partnerships recommended by donors who invest in parallel in developing counties;
• GCARD country and regional consultations are the 1st stage of the “how”, where engagement with partners enables to align research with to development priorities in countries and regions.

New types of partnerships mean investing time and resources to engage with partners who have different values, principles and culture (eg some Centers have developed charters to engage with private sector). This may imply getting new staff on board, with new profiles, or drawing on skills from partners on board the new CRPs, who could constitute what is referred to as “backbone support”. If well coordinated, should also prevent duplication of efforts between Centers and CRPs. Example of AAS which has developed a new model for partnership where CRP has a catalyzing / brokering role with new skill sets on board.

Important to engage with partners from the outset and continuously as “sounding board,” but also to involve partners in decisions. But also to answer the question of what types of partners do CRPs need in the next 10 years: technical, institutional, scaling-up? SRF should specifically indicate the need to engage with policy makers since policies and enabling environment are key to achieve impact.

Participants suggest we share experiences of what worked and what did not, among others lessons learnt from CPs

Numerous points on the “how” with the question of how much should be in the SRF vs in the CRP 2nd call guidance doc:
• Partnership for impact still too much on the “what” and not enough on the how – with emphasis on strategic partnerships, including partners rights and duties (esp. in decision and access to CGIAR funding – since rules for accessing to decision and to funding remain unclear).
• Which mechanisms for accountability and sustainability of our partnerships?
Full Notes
This is the fourth of the webinar series providing a further opportunity to comment on CGIAR’s Strategy and Results Framework – one of the consultations that are part of the overall GCARD process.

In this fourth webinar Alain Vidal from the CGIAR Consortium Office, hosted a discussion exploring partnership for impact in the SRF and how partnering and partnerships for impact is reflected in the revised version of the SRF. How can this be strengthened to make the SRF an effective roadmap for agricultural research for development? This topic can be found throughout the SRF and particularly in a section on pages 38-41 of the current version of the SRF.

After welcoming the participants to the webinar, Alain introduced himself and his role in the CGIAR Consortium. Three things characterize the way we have tried to strategize our partnerships in this last version of the SRF.

1. The research for development done by CGIAR only accounts for 3% of resources so CGIAR needs to partner and partners will need to come from north and south, from the public, private and NGO sectors. CGIAR sees these as equal partners but noting some of the partners will need increased capacity to partner effectively.

2. We know that some of the issues we are tackling now and in the next 10 years are too big for CGIAR alone and so we need to engage in large coalitions to address research and impact at scale. Investment on pilot projects is not sufficient and we need to deliver impact at scale. CGIAR alone, even with the best research partners, need to work beyond that.

3. It was strongly recommended to us by the donors that money is available in the developing world and they would like to invest in those systems rather than channeling money to CGIAR.

However, what we value is your input, so let’s start the discussion.

Comment #1: I find this an interesting proposition of partnership in SRF now – have you received any feedback on this from others?

Host: Some positive feedback to the three changes overall and not much negative feedback from inside the CGIAR. Not much feedback on building large coalitions – this idea is still a bit new.

Comment #2: How is CGIAR going to engage efficiently with such a wide diverse world of partners?

Host: Many are concerned about the transactions costs of dealing with diverse partners (e.g. private sector who have different objectives; partners with cultural differences). To me it means we need to invest in partnerships – we will need to dedicate time and energy to the partnerships. We need to have rules and principles so our ethics (e.g. open access) are taken into account. We may need to staff programs with staff having different profiles, staff that don’t have just high publication rates but those that are skilled and dedicated to partnerships.

Comment #3: There is no doubt for us (CIRAD) that we have to work with CGIAR as well as other partners.

Comment #4: What will be the mechanisms for partnerships? The why and what is well described in the SRF but the how is still to be elaborated.

Facilitator: The SRF is the strategy and there are other documents e.g. guidance note and development of second generation CRPs that will provide more of these details. But maybe the SRF needs to elaborate a bit more on the ‘how’.
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Host: Part of the how is alignment. This mechanism is part of GCARD consultation to be held over the next few months to see how CGIAR research aligns with national development priorities and agendas. It is clear that there will be no other choice but to engage with partners in these countries.

Comment #5: There are different levels of agenda setting and GCARD is an important process. But CRPs tend to be regional and global and they should be at national level. Furthermore, engaging and working with partners should be ongoing not just at the beginning as a sounding board.

Host: We need to have partners on board to help define priorities, make decisions and help decisions on the CRPs – to me it’s more than just a sounding board.

Comment #6: I’ve been looking at how institutional partnerships between CGIAR and Netherlands can be optimized. Partnerships are important and we need to invest in them – probably more time than we would like as scientists. In the Dutch inventory of partnerships, people felt that partnership is costing too much time and not being too effective. How to best collaborate in the CGIAR system? Need to invest but in a sensible way.

Is it possible to share between us experiences that have worked and not worked in previous round of CRPs and Challenge Programs? I am particularly talking about strategic partnerships.

Host: In my previous role as the Director of Water and Food I learned my lessons learned on partnership. The experience we had with partners who were not research partners was that it was quite time consuming – it takes about one year to know each other. From a donor perspective that is one year lost to scientific production. However, it is a long term investment but worthwhile. During the GCARD process we expect to fully engage with partners.

Comment #7: How do we ensure partnerships within our centers within the different programs and projects to avoid duplication of efforts? The other question is the mechanism for accountability and sustainability of our partnerships?

Comment #8: One thing we are talking about 3% of total global public spending on agricultural research comes from CGIAR expenditure which means huge magnitude of contributions to CGIAR goals as specified in this SRF is expected to come from others such as NARS, ARI, AIRCAs, and many developed and developing country NARS and through South-South and North-South partnership and specific networking arrangements by GFAR and a number of regional such as APAARI. This means the comparative advantage and niche possessed by CGIAR needs to be harnessed through partnerships between CG and others. Yet, the SRF document is unclear on the partnership strategy (modus operandi), as the basis for designing and implementing such partnerships with above category organizations. We are expecting that this other sector has come forward to achieve the CGIAR goals. How to come out with a strategic focus on dealing with outside partners?

You are focusing on CRPs when developing partnership programs. Why not look at what others are doing and how to partner with those that are also contributing to SRF goals – we in other organizations are developing partnerships and this should be recognized in the SRF.

GFAR is instrumental at mobilizing partnerships at global and regional level so that non-CGIAR partners can engage with CGIAR programs.

Host: How to engage with programs that are also contributing to the SRF? To me the answer is in building large collation of partners. For example, if we want to tackle the issue of nutrition (in the developed and developing world; in both under nutrition and obesity) we clearly can’t do it alone. The challenge for CGIAR
in such coalitions is that CG should not be the leader but could be the facilitator. The leader could be a more skilled organization. We should be open that in some cases CG is not the key player but a facilitator.

For example, in the Andes region, CGIAR is not the leader on the issues of Payment for Environmental Services, but can be a facilitator in getting some of this into the global arena.

We really count on GFAR to help us (CGIAR) identify the right partners; those that can help us achieve impact at scale, and when we start aligning with national level priorities. There might be other players, but we really count on GFAR to do that.

We want to avoid overlapping CRPs dealing with the same partners. We do need to develop a mechanism to do this. The Fund Office is more about partners with resource mobilization (the business), so we need to harmonize and avoid duplication.

Comment #9: We have opened up our focal regions to open and competitive calls so partners can be involved and become leaders. We have 175 partners with the majority outside of CGIAR system.

Comment #10: What about partnership for Policy Advocacy and Creating Enabling Environment – with public institutions and policy makers. This requires strategic consideration if the CG outcomes are to be effective. What is the contribution of partnership to institutions so they contribute to policy, not just technologies?

Comment #11: I think a strategy is about the what and also the how. I still think the partnerships for impact part in the SRF has very little on the how, both at Consortium and CRP level. If there was more on this it would be helpful for partners. However, do it on the strategic partnerships, not the operational project partnerships. For example, how partners would be running a CRP, from a strategic point of view?

I agree that it takes time to develop partnerships.

I can’t find much about lessons learned from the past and how this informs the SRF in the future.

Comment #12: From our experience as non-CGIAR partners, it seems that the rules for access of funds are not very clear. This has been a limitation for more involvement of our research team to these programs. Researchers need funds to do research and when we look at CRP budget it seems that 15-30% is dedicated to non-CGIAR partners but in practice this rule has not been very clear. It should be clarified to be more explicit in the SRF.

Facilitator: There is some wording the SRF (page 38) but if there are suggestions on how this can be strengthened or aligned with partner’s needs this would be welcomed.

Comment #13: On page 41 the development of infrastructure doesn’t reflect the coalition approach being spoken about here. This text is more for CGIAR than for partners – could the document be modified to better reflect how infrastructure development could be for partners?

Comment #14: What is meant by “Backbone support” in the SRF (page 39)?

Host: The term reflects looking at putting in a team of partnership people – not just researchers. You need dedicated teams working in centers to avoid duplication, to put accountability on partnerships. As an example, CCAFS are quite tough on partners and when they don’t deliver/contribute, they drop off from the program.
Comment #15: If partners are shaping the programs, who is it for the CGIAR to kick them off? A bit of clarity on what are the partner’s roles would be a good addition to the SRF.

Comment #16: The Aquatic Agricultural Systems CRP has been evolving its view of partnerships and moving away from a transactional world view to more of a collaborative environment where the program plays a catalytic role in engaging partners and stakeholders at the front end of designing the research. The front end is anchored on the development challenges and the communities where we work help develop this.

When I look at the SRF I’m happy with the principles as articulated but echo concerns on “how” to make this happen. Partners have different capacities, agendas, and ambitions. For AAS it was helpful to segment partners to understand what they can best contribute and put in place enabling conditions for partners to contribute, for example... facilitation capabilities. This is some of the learning we have experienced. Maybe the SRF could be strengthened if the CGIAR could begin to think about what type of partners they imagine over the 10 years e.g. scaling partners, technical partners, etc. This would have a grounded approach to the principles.

Host (summing up and closing)
There have been some very good points made this morning that could improve the partnership section in the SRF. To come back to a few issues that has come up in the webinar.

- Because it is a strategic document it is worth being more explicit on the investment of time and resources in partnership, to define the skill sets that have been referred to and to ask CRPs what sort of partners they need to make their program impactful.

- I take on board the sharing of experiences on what worked and what didn’t and would like to work with others in this.

- Partners’ rights and duties are insufficiently articulated in the SRF – probably more on this is in the guidance note for the CRP second call; including access to funding. We understand from the donors that they are insisting that partners should bring their own funding, even if the funds are coming from the same donors who support the CRPs. We recognize that this is not always possible and so have mechanisms such as mentioned by WLE where funding can be shared with partners. The clear message from donors is that if we have long-term strategic partners their engagement should be sustained by funding they mobilize themselves. This includes partners from both developing and developed countries. What we need to do is convince policy makers in developing countries that they must invest in research for development and that it is not CGIAR that is funding research in the countries. CAACP commitment to investment in agriculture has largely not been respected and this should be done so money goes to partners.

I’d like to thank all of you who joined the webinar for your input.

5. Webinar on youth and the SRF
Date: Thursday 19th February 2015

Summary by host- Courtney Paisley, YPARD
Areas of consensus include:
1. While it was widely applauded that youth are a cross-cutting issue in the SRF, there was disappointment in that there is little mention of youth in the text. It seems as though youth is an afterthought and not adequately integrated into the text.

2. Youth are not only beneficiaries, they are active agents of change, they are partners in the SRF and they are the leaders of tomorrow. Youth must be part of the opening statement to recognize that they are part of the solution. While youth have traditionally been seen as PhD candidates, fellows and interns, we must shift on truly engaging youth within the sector, enabling them to be part of the planning and process and working towards their future.

3. Youth are one of the largest groups where the CGIAR will be working (with some countries having 60% of youth population). They will be those largest impacted by these activities and therefore, must be fully considered within programs.

4. Many felt that there is simply very little information on youth – very little age-disaggregated data. How can the CGIAR address youth as one of the cross-cutting issues without fully understanding their needs? In order to develop responsive strategies to the situation, more information is required, and thus age-disaggregated data should be included in the section ‘from research to impact’.

5. There was recognition that lumping youth and gender into the same cross-cutting theme is not helpful. Youth and women have very different needs and strategies to address them must be different. It was agreed that at the very least this should be recognized in the SRF.

6. The modalities of youth empowerment is not recognized in the text. Some suggestions could be included, or if inappropriate in the SRF, additional documentation is required.

7. Youth must be included as an indicator to ensure it is included in planning and programs.

8. Youth have specific capacity development needs, to meet the needs of a changing sector. The key linkages between youth and capacity development should be recognized.

9. This is a future-focused document but no youth input was provided in its development. To have an SRF that is shaping the future, youth input is essential, as it is they who will be implementing these actions. Youth input is required for long term strategy documents.

Specifically – on page 29 under the gender and youth cross cutting issue, it says ‘Improved capacity of women and young people to participate in decision-making’ but there is no reference to this in the text and no statements that indicate anything supporting this outcome.

Follow Up

It was felt that as youth engagement is a relatively new theme for many working within the CGIAR, some are uncertain on how to implement this cross-cutting theme. It was decided that guidance documents are required to inform on the needs of youth, why this is so important and the modalities of engaging with them. YPARD can take the lead on this alongside other organizations to provide some insight.

Full Notes

This is the fifth of the webinar series providing an opportunity to give more comments and input on CGIAR’s Strategy and Results Framework – one of the consultations that are part of the overall GCARD process.

In this fifth webinar Courtney Paisley Director of YPARD, hosted a discussion exploring the perspective of young agricultural scientists on the SRF itself and how youth is addressed in the strategy.
After welcoming the participants to the webinar, Courtney explained that YPARD is partnering with CGIAR particularly in better ways to engage youth in CGIAR, CRPs and the SRF; to engage youth and make them part of decision making as well as targeting youth in programs and projects. As Courtney pointed out, the webinar has had a lot of interest and shows the wide array of groups that are interested in talking about this subject.

She went on to say that engagement of youth is a relatively new topic and not something that has mainstreamed in the CGIAR and agriculture sector in general. Young people have been seen as PhD candidates, fellowships and internship and that’s how youth have been involved up to recently. With the decline of interest of young people in the sector, big challenges in agriculture, youth unemployment etc., and people have started to realize how important it is to engage young people in the sector and the need for innovative leaders to take on these future challenges. We are starting to see a shift of the importance of youth as seen in this webinar and as seen in the SRF. Getting young people involved is starting to be a true priority for organizations.

In the SRF youth is directly referenced on page 6 and 7 (demand for opportunities for youth), page 12 (a beneficiary), page 19 (nutrition in terms of the next generation), page 27 (briefly as cross cutting issue), page 29 (included in diagram of cross cutting issues and engaging young people), page 31 indirectly as creating opportunities for marginalized groups and then in building intergenerational capacity.

This discussion has a couple of things. First to look at youth in the SRF and whether it adequately talks about how to engage youth within this road map especially looking at young, innovative leaders to come. And then try to get a few impressions from youth leaders/ youth supporters on the SRF as a roadmap in AR4D and whether it meets the future you want to see.

Comment #1: I welcome CGIAR’s initiative to engage with young people. However, in my reading of the SRF I was a bit disappointed that youth and young people only mentioned a handful of time and are largely seen as beneficiaries of CGIAR work. In the countries where CGIAR works young people make up between 20 to 60% of the population, agriculture is still a leading employer of young rural people. CGIAR’s SLOs are arguably more critical for young people more than any other demographic at this time. Yet there is insufficient data on young people in rural development; what obstacles do they face; how are we creating enabling environments to overcome staggering rates of youth unemployment? How do we foster intergenerational learning to better manage land? When age disaggregated data is available it is not often published. So, if we don’t understand the needs of such an important demographic how is it possible to design effective development projects? As someone who has been working in the youth space for 12 months now these are questions I often ask myself. Not so long ago, these same questions were asked about gender. Resources have been poured into gender strategies and gender research to get a body of evidence in this area. If we can be gender sensitive why can’t we be more youth sensitive? I think CGIAR is one of, if not the most well placed consortium to be leading the world in rural youth research. It’s starting to happen; the Drylands CRP is putting together a youth strategy and has allocated 7% of budget to youth and gender research. But I think we need to see youth play a more central role in the SRF, a commitment to youth research strategy, a push for more age disaggregated data, youth analysis embedded in the research systems portfolio, development of tools, methods and data sets that will strengthen our understanding of the role that young people play in development.

Comment #2: I welcome that youth have the opportunity to speak.

Comment #3: One of the issues I want to make is that we need to be quite clear that lumping youth and gender together can be a positive thing but also they are very different issues at some levels. On a very practical level, my experience in doing mainstreaming type of stuff is to make sure you put it in the problem
statement – so then all the solutions roll out of that. Put it somewhere in the beginning of the SRF so it’s not just beneficiaries but they are part of the solution.

Comment #4: I agree it is not a good idea to lump gender and youth together. Even in the field when you go to gender there are problems. If youth is lumped up with gender it would be hard to have enough resources.

I think youth participation is well recognized but modalities of youth empowerment are not there in the SRF. When talking about youth the only suggestion that seems to come up is training, internships and PhD possibilities. But there is not much on how do to this and recognizing this explicitly in the SRF would be great. I know this is a strategic document but people are not very aware of the modalities on how to empower youth. In the SRF, (page 43) there is a statement that each CRP will develop specific results framework outlining expected results and corresponding metrics, impact pathways and theories of change, procedures for internal and external evaluation, and processes for learning and adaptation. I think that there, an explicit indicator to youth could be helpful. For example, when we look at gender indicators we see them but for I don’t see many youth indicators.

It is hard for youth to have key positions but there are some new research tools that are not well established in the system and which there is a lot of interest. If the SRF can make explicit mention of these new research methods, especially in multi-disciplinary science, this will automatically favour youth.

Comment #5: We need to see young people not only as beneficiaries and part of the solution. There is a need for more research focused on the needs of youth and their role in the sector. There is a need for M&E mechanisms to make sure that programs address youth needs.

Concrete points I’d like make are:
- On page 29, in the sub IDOs, add an additional bullet point on enhanced capacity development and training for youth empowerment. Or another option might be to have a bullet point on youth aspects under the capacity development cross cutting item.
- Under youth empowerment, in addition to getting young people into decision making, getting more young people in the design, and implementation of the CRPs
- On page 30 in the research priority areas it could mention the need for youth consideration and age disaggregated research, the same way it is made explicit for gender.
- Page 40 the SRF could take some examples from the IITA youth entrepreneur case which is a success story.
- Page 43, M&E indicators do take into account youth and gender component but we need to make sure that this is practically exploited at the CRP level.

Comment #6: What are the strategies for working with national universities – in India 20% students come from rural farming communities. Can CGIAR train them for a few weeks so that they can take these technologies to the farmers?

Comment #7: Youth are not very evident or engaged in what is supposed to be a forward looking document. Stronger language is required in this on how youth are going to be engaged as the implementers of some of this work and how are their ideas becoming part of this. Also suggesting that youth are both a recipient and a deliverer of capacity development and that this might be better reflected in that section of the SRF.

Host: I agree with the previous comment. This is a future focused document and even though youth is mentioned it seems it was done as a bit of an afterthought and not developed with youth in mind. It would be worthwhile to add substance to the SRF where youth is mentioned. As an example, youth is included in the diagram on page 29 however this is not explained in the text. This should be explained in the text.
As a future focused document there should be something related to innovation and youth as the next generation. Youth should be part of innovation strategies. Innovation should be broadened and in this case youth need to be clearly part of that.

It would be helpful to have some youth thought leaders bring out some of these aspects with some of the documents and engagement of them as part of the planning process would be very welcome.

Also agree with inclusion in the research priority areas on youth issues and collection of age disaggregated data. As has been said, can’t solve the problems unless you have the data to support it.

Youth and gender, as cross cutting issues, have very different needs and different approaches and these needs to be explicitly recognized, with some examples, in the SRF. It is most likely that CRPs will require different strategies for youth and gender.

Comment #8: Discussion has been ongoing on what goes into the SRF and what goes into the Guidance Note for CRPs so there is still scope for this. Certainly the Gender Network has come up with some key principles. Also the Capacity Development Group have their own framework with 9 elements which they are trying to socialize with CRPs. They don’t want all CRPs to develop their own individual strategies and rather work around the 9 principles.

Comment #9: Excellent idea that youth have a strategy. Is there an appetite among YPARD to do this or at least put into the SRF that something will happen in this regard?

Host: Going forward it is something YPARD could do. They have already engaged youth in the Drylands CRP and it is something they would consider for the SRF.

Comment #10: There is a need to write into the SRF that there is a difference between youth and gender. Would also be useful include some of the modalities – put it in the problem statement so it is part of the whole thing. CGIAR still struggles with social science – need to push some of the social science thinking in the SRF.

Comment #11: My question would be on how will the CPRs be able to use the SRF and to be sure that they follow the strategy and expected results? Should SRF give some hints about how they will follow this framework – concretely and practically?

Comment #12: There is a very practical Guidance Document (including templates) being developed which address some of this. I keep hearing that we need the pointers between the SRF and Guidance Document.

Host: SRF language should be more of future facing especially in regards to youth. SRF is not explicit on being able to adapt and as things change new innovations, new ideas, new approaches should be brought in.

Comment #13: Maybe a broader understanding of youth and their role in agricultural development is required in the SRF?

Comment #14: For some us we are not trained in these sorts of things and are being asked to integrate this in our work. We could do with more understanding of the modalities so that it becomes logical. A certain amount of awareness needs to be raised. Those making decisions are not aware. A thought piece within the SRF would be worthwhile.

Comment #15: SRF is one part of the puzzle and there are another set of activities for the CRPs. This consultation is part of the GCARD which is a longer term process that provides space for more consultation,
collective action and collaboration on issues of interest in agricultural research for development and the way these should be approached in the whole system.

Comment #16: I agree with separating gender and youth. Also the SRF should more clearly describe capacity development and how youth can be involved in this.

In summing up, Courtney noted that the areas of consensus included:

10. While it was widely applauded that youth are a cross-cutting issue in the SRF, there was disappointment in that there is little mention of youth in the text. It seems as though youth is an afterthought and not adequately integrated into the text.

11. Youth are not only beneficiaries, they are active agents of change, they are partners in the SRF and they are the leaders of tomorrow. Youth must be part of the opening statement to recognize that they are part of the solution. While youth have traditionally been seen as PhD candidates, fellows and interns, we must shift on truly engaging youth within the sector, enabling them to be part of the planning and process and working towards their future.

12. Youth are one of the largest groups where the CGIAR will be working (with some countries having 60% of youth population). They will be those largest impacted by these activities and therefore, must be fully considered within programs.

13. Many felt that there is simply very little information on youth – very little age-disaggregated data. How can the CGIAR address youth as one of the cross-cutting issues without fully understanding their needs? In order to develop responsive strategies to the situation, more information is required, and thus age-disaggregated data should be included in the section ‘from research to impact’.

14. There was recognition that lumping youth and gender into the same cross-cutting theme is not helpful. Youth and women have very different needs and strategies to address them must be different. It was agreed that at the very least this should be recognized in the SRF.

15. The modalities of youth empowerment are not recognized in the text. Some suggestions could be included, or if inappropriate in the SRF, additional documentation is required.

16. Youth must be included as an indicator to ensure it is included in planning and programmes.

17. Youth have specific capacity development needs, to meet the needs of a changing sector. The key linkages between youth and capacity development should be recognized.

18. This is a future-focused document but no youth input was provided in its development. To have an SRF that is shaping the future, youth input is essential, as it is they who will be implementing these actions. Youth input is required for long term strategy documents.

19. Specifically – on page 29 under the gender and youth cross cutting issue, it says ‘Improved capacity of women and young people to participate in decision-making’ but there is no reference to this in the text and no statements that indicate anything supporting this outcome.

As follow up it was felt that as youth engagement is a relatively new theme for many working within the CGIAR, some are uncertain on how to implement this cross-cutting theme. It was decided that guidance documents are required to inform on the needs of youth, why this is so important and the modalities of engaging with them. YPARD can take the lead on this alongside other organizations to provide some insight.

6. Webinar on Research domains (Cancelled due to lack of participation)