Summary of main messages and suggestions for strengthening the SRF: The ‘Top Ten’ and ‘Big Five’

From the second phase of Consultation on the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)- Phase 2 3rd-27th February 2015

Based on an analysis of the consultation results by GFAR and the Consortium Office
In the second phase of consultation on the 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?”

Wide dissemination of the invitation to provide comments and join discussion groups was done through both CGIAR and GFAR. 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
Consultation Results Overview

There was generally positive feedback on the latest version of the SRF including numerous comments that it had ‘matured’ or ‘evolved in a good direction’

Around 60 people participated, over 60% from non-CGIAR entities and around 40% women

The majority of people participated through the webinars, followed by the Public Chat Room and then via email.

All results from the SRF Consultation are available at: http://www.cgiar.org/srfconsultation/srf-consultation-results/
Summary of main trends- ‘Top Ten’:
The main messages from the Consultation

1. Strengthen the language of partnership and contribution
2. Clearer definition of capacity development and capacity to innovate
3. Revision of cross cutting area on ‘Women and Youth’
4. Recognition of various types of partners and roles and responsibilities
5. The SRF should indicate more of the ‘how’ it will be implemented
6. Reflection on major objective of CGIAR research – is it helping poor farmers or producing cheaper food? Or?
7. All cross cutting areas should also be included as research areas
8. Explanation of why indicators and targets are not included
9. Cross cutting areas to be better reflected in the text-and part of strategy- not just in the tables.
10. Better description of opportunities and modalities for partnering
Summary of main trends- ‘The Big Five’: The main messages to prioritise in the revisions

1. Move away from language and concepts reflecting a linear style of knowledge and technology transfer by strengthening the language throughout the SRF to reflect partnership and contribution (rather than accountability). The principle being that CGIAR is only one player in the arena and will work with many partners in achieving the steps along the impact pathway

2. Clearer definition of capacity development and stronger indication of the broader scope of capacity to innovate (NOT just about training) and inclusion in CGIAR niche

3. Cross cutting area on ‘Women (and Youth)’ be reconsidered as ‘Gender relations’- and possibly decoupled from youth

4. Recognition and categorisation of types of partners and roles and responsibilities they may play in the strategy implementation-including specific attention to role of farmers and the youth as more than beneficiaries

5. The SRF should indicate what other documents and processes will be used to determine and articulate the ‘how’ – e.g. guidance note, GCARD process and ongoing dialogues and engagement, future generations of research programs
DETAILS:

Some Specific Questions and suggestions on some of the main areas and elements of the SRF
CGIAR Niche

Questions:
• What is the (real) niche of CGIAR?
• How does CGIAR work with others to achieve the outcomes outlined?
• Is it about accountability or contribution?

Suggestions:
• Some of the areas outlined in the niche need to better reflect the more innovative articulation in some of the main sections-such as the cross cutting areas (e.g. capacity development, partnerships, gender)
Impact Pathways

Suggestions:

• Need to move away from some of the concepts and language in the SRF that reflect a linear form of transfer of outputs/knowledge/technologies

• Need to show the role of variety of players along impact pathway
  – particular consideration of central role of farmers, youth—not only as passive recipient/beneficiaries but as active players

• E.g comment from consultation- ‘implicit throughout the SRF is knowledge generation and transmission as a one-way process– from those that have it (CG system and research partners) to those that don’t have it (farmers and “non-research partners”)

  – The part on “Achieving impact at scale” reflects again the old paradigm of technology transfer from research to recipients. It will not be only and perhaps not even primarily through dissemination of technology that the CGIAR and its partners will achieve impact at scale but rather through collaboration in changing methodologies, approaches, institutions and policies.
Research: Results Framework, Research priorities etc

Questions:
• What is the main objective of CGIAR’s research for development work? - to help small scale poor farmers or to produce cheaper food for cities?
• Where are the indicators and targets?
• Is it about CGIAR being accountable or contributing?

Suggestions:
• If no decision can be made on the objective-at least to indicate that there are these two types of objectives at play
• If not going to put in targets and indicators-at least explain this and why not, and where these will be addressed
Cross cutting areas

Comment:
• The cross-cutting areas included are greatly appreciated

Suggestions:
• Cross cutting areas to be better reflected in the text of the document—not just in the tables e.g a comment from consultation asked—‘The SLOs with their IDOs and sub-IDOs are well explained in the text. Please give the same attention to the text for the cross-cutting issues’.
• Concern over coupling of women(gender) and youth.
• Cross cutting areas should be considered in the research portfolio as research areas and not just as considerations and implementation support. Gender and climate change are present in the research table but capacity development and youth are not. Need research on capacity development and need for age-disaggregated data to be collected.
Gender

Suggestions:

• Strong position shown by many that the SRF should refer to gender relations rather than women for the cross cutting issue

• Concern over coupling of women(gender) and youth—as they have very different issues to be addressed and use different approaches to address them. Worry that this will dilute both their needs, as resources (financial and human) will now have to be used to cover both of these
Partnerships and partnering for impact

Questions:
• Do we know what modalities we should be using for partnering? Have we learnt lessons from past efforts to inform this new strategy? Will non-research partners (including farmers) be clearly identified as partners in the SRF?

Suggestions:
• The language throughout the SRF needs to reflect a partnership principle that CGIAR is only one player in the arena and will work with many partners in achieving the steps along the impact pathway
• Need to reflect the various types of partners and the different roles and responsibilities they may play in the strategy (including being clear on the role and responsibility of CGIAR in relation to others)
• Point to modalities or plans to develop appropriate modalities to engage with various partners e.g “how to engage non-research partners beyond using them as an implementation mechanism.”
Capacity Development

Questions:
• How can we best reflect a broader definition of capacity development that includes increasing the capacity to innovate by CGIAR entities and partner institutions as well as the beneficiaries and to strengthen broader innovation system?

Suggestions:
• Should be included in the CGIAR niche as one of the CGIAR value-adds
• Still needs a clearer definition and articulation to better reflect the broader concept of capacity development which looks at improving the capacity to innovate of the system as a whole. SRF could perhaps indicate what CapDev is NOT= it is NOT just about formal training
• Stronger reflection of capacity to innovate concept
• Better link between CapDev and partnership
• Better link between CapDev and the youth
**The ‘How’**

**Questions:**

- Across all topics a consistent question that came up was about ‘how’ the various aspects of the strategy will be carried out.

**Suggestions:**

- The SRF should indicate what other documents and processes will be used to determine and articulate the ‘how’- e.g. guidance note, GCARD process and ongoing dialogues and engagement, future generations of research programs.
- Need to strengthen language on role of GCARD in supporting partnerships and accountability etc.
- The ‘how’ should reflect partnership principles—that CGIAR will be doing this along with many other (types of) partners-so they can/should make use of skills sets, capacities and comparative advantage of different partners.
- Link to capacity development work—as CGIAR, partners and beneficiaries will all require improved skills sets and capacities to undertake and benefit from the work over the next ten years.