Questions & Answers

CGIAR Research Programs & Platforms
Second Call Guidance for Proposals

Questions & answers on CRP full proposals and Platforms are listed hereafter. A section dedicated to the outline submission tool can be found at the end of this FAQ. Any additional questions that occur during the writing and tool testing stages, should be sent to crp-proposals@cgiar.org and this FAQ can be extended in the future.

Q1 What is the timing for the templates to be provided? We are concerned that several templates key for the submission will only be provided as part of the online tool at end February.

A1 We are providing all templates in a SharePoint folder here.

Q2 Tables, figures, and page limits: Annex 2, pages 53-55, mentions that the page limits exclude tables and figures. Please confirm that this is the case for all tables and figures.

A2 See answer to online submission tool 1&2.

Q3 Page limit 25 or 26 for section on the CRP overall: Annex 2, page 53, has total number of pages for CRP level component of proposal at 26. By our count the page limits of the various sections under the CRP level component add up to 25, not 26.

A3 You are correct. IA and OA/OD annexes were omitted in error, and have been added.

Q4 Page limits for flagship level 17 or 16?

A4 17 is correct.

Q5 Content for the section on RBM: Section 3.6 on pages 26-30. What will be included in the "guidance on operationalization of the RBM framework by the CRPs and Platforms [which] is being developed by the MELCoP and will be available through the online tool"?

A5 Templates for budget and PIM have been provided to CSE Colleagues, and are available in a SharePoint folder here. Guidance to writers of the RBM sections will be made available shortly (courtesy of the MEL CoP) and will be attached to the online tool help section.

Q6 Management structure: Section 3.11 on page 35, "CRP proposals will need to identify an Independent Steering Committee, a CRP Leader and a CRP Management Committee". Can you clarify the requirements in the proposal regarding the Independent Steering Committee and the Management Committee?

A6 It is for the review of CRPs to address this and the state of proposal development in the absence of these two committees.

Q7 Budgeting separately for various areas (gender, partners, etc.): The guidance mentions that specific budgets will need to be identified for a number of areas (gender, youth, capacity building, partnerships…), and for some of these gives indicative percentages. Many activities contribute jointly; e.g., to capacity building and partnerships. We would like to make sure that the online template will allow for the sum of these different budgets to exceed 100%, as there will be some overlap between them.

A7 A statement of headline budgets for all activities (listed in chapter 3) should be made in: a) the narratives and then repeated; b) a section attached to the budget reporting (section 5 of Annex 3.1 / section 4 of Annex 3.2). The narrative should explain discrepancies.

Q8 How will CVs be formatted? Annex 2, page 55, item 3.8 of the template.

A8 An outline template for CVs is included in the set of templates available in a SharePoint folder here.

Q9 The gender sections: In the templates, it states that the overall CRP description should have a 4-page max gender section (#1.4), while there should also be a gender annex (#3.4) of 4-page max on gender - this means 8 pages in total with the potential for quite a bit of redundancy. Or is the reference to 4 pages at both locations a mistake? Please clarify.

A9 This is to clarify that the Full proposal online template will ask for two different types of content related to gender:

1. A CRP narrative in which CRP proposers report on how gender research enters into the targeting and fabric of the issues they are trying to address, the impact pathways and how progress will be monitored.
2. An additional four page "gender Annex" to meet Fund Council requirements and which includes 2 pages summarizing the gender analysis that was done before research priorities were set, and how that informed priority setting. The other 2 pages should summarize how gender will be operationalized in the research agenda and how progress will be tracked and ultimately evaluated. [The need for such a section is explained in an attachment to the help section of the on-line tool, noting that funders are tracking progress at least through 2018.]

The Annex is requested by the FC to understand how gender research informed CRP Program-level priority setting. This Annex should not duplicate what is supplied in the narrative. Some CRP pre-proposals did not include this Annex.

If you conclude that prior gender research has not yet informed CRP priorities sufficiently, then the Annex is the place to analyze what needs to be done to make this happen – and operationally what you need to achieve it.

Work yet to be done will obviously be included in the main proposal, but please do not repeat in the Annex, text supplied elsewhere. The Annex is an opportunity to explain in more detail what type of gender studies, data, human and financial resources are needed to inform and shape the program's priorities -- so please cross reference text already in the main proposal and make the content of the Annex additive not repetitive.

Note that there is a need to describe gender activities specific to FPs additionally.

Q10 Will there be requests for annexes on IA and OADM, with what page limitation?

A10 The omission of a page limit for annexes for OA/OD and IA management was an oversight that is addressed in the online tool for proposal submission. Annexes for these activities are requested and 4 pages will be allowed for each.

Q11 PIM: what templates should be used?

A11 Essentially the very large PIM that was requested in the pre-proposal stage has been broken down, in part at the request of the CRPs, into the three tables provided as Annex 3.3 of the Guidance. These are formatted tables in the on-line tool. This leaves the annual milestones 2017 – 2022, for which a table 4 will be included in the online tool.

Q12 The template on cross-CRP collaboration and site integration (item 1.7 of annex 2 in the guidance) refers to an annex of 6 pages that includes two tables. Please could you share the template of these two tables?

A12 We are providing all templates in a SharePoint folder here.

Q13 Can additional annexes that are not listed in section #3 on annexes be submitted?

A13 Yes, and the online submission tool will have a space for CRP-specific annex material. However, perhaps a preferable means would be for narratives to include a few hyperlinks to additional materials on CRP sites.

Q14 When terms are not defined in the full proposal guidance, can we refer to the pre-proposal guidance (e.g., things like 'science quality')? Related to terms, should we use 'flagship projects' or 'flagship programs'? The guidance uses both and then the budget templates use FS as the abbreviation.

A14 Yes, suggest using CRPs, Flagships, Clusters of activities, Platforms and modules on the key units of program and portfolio organization.

Q15 RBM and Performance Management: the reference to section 1.15 in the second bullet point on top of P29 may be a typo because it is not consistent with the RBM section on page 27. In that section it says that risks associated with realization of outcomes are in sections 1.3 and 2.3 while other program risks are described in section 1.15.

A15 Agreed. Text on p. 27 distinguishes the two elements of risk assessment that should be reported. Section 1.15 refers to other program risks.

Q16 Youth Strategy: is the four-page youth strategy (Annex 3.5) required?

A16 A Youth Strategy is required. It cannot be longer than 4 pages. It is up to the CRP to determine the activities being proposed for 2017-2022, their scope, and the way they relate to an overall strategy for youth.

Q17 Budget tables in Annex 3.1 and 3.2

1. Budget templates are not clear enough. Annex 3.1 - each point (e.g., No.1 Summary, No. 2 CRP funding plan) asks for further explanation, but it looks like a title for the table right below, or the table answers the question above, although the table does seem to answer the question.
2. Will the online template have space to add the requested narrative? The templates in the guidance do not show that space.
3. Annex 3.2 – It is not clear what exactly is being asked about consultants. Should we identify them for the entire period?

Where do we show budget for things like capacity development, gender, and youth on the overall CRP rollup table? We are only given list of FPs and a line for CRP management and support cost. Do we add extra lines on the template for these costs?

A17 The Consortium Office provided budget tables and requirements for their completion to the CSEs in January. Other questions can be asked through the CRP proposal address crp-proposals@cgiar.org and training for lead Center finance directors is being organized.

Re: Q17.4 Budgets for individual sections/activities like capacity development, etc. will not be part of roll-up tables, but will be stated in narratives and again in section 6 of the CRP proposal budget narrative (Annex 3.1 in the guidance), and in section 4 of the Flagship proposal narrative (Annex 3.2 in the guidance) as appropriate.

Q18 Table 1 Contributions to SLO impacts: how should we handle the filling of the column on requested budgets per SLO impact?

A18 Filling PIM table A is a requirement. The targets are CGIAR targets and the request is to identify the overall CRP contribution to these targets. Presumably the higher level targets will subsume several avenues or types of research. Contributions should not be more than the CRP six year budget.

Q19 PIM tables in Annex 3.3

1. For the PIM, there are many outcomes in the SRF not covered by the SRF targets. The SRF targets were developed as an illustrative list of what the CGIAR could contribute to and was not meant to be comprehensive. How do we accommodate other important outcome / impact targets that are needed for IDO and sub-IDO success beyond these illustrative targets?
2. Confirm whether Tables 1-3 are for the value for money analysis, for performance monitoring, or both. The guidance is inconsistent on this (e.g., p. 47 calls them templates for VFM).
3. Are the outcomes in table 2 to be defined by the CRP? The examples given in the guidance don't make this clear and seem to overlap with the outcomes in Tables 1 and 3.
4. Relatedly, how are Table 2 and Table 3 in the PIM different?
5. Footnote 1 in Table 2 says a supporting narrative with outputs by year should be in the proposal. Is this supposed to be in Section 2.2 of the template? This not clear from the (very confusing) way 2.2 is described on page 54.

The underlined sentences on page 30 says that "less-detailed" versions of the PI matrices must to be submitted for the uplift version of the budget. What does "less-detailed" mean? Do we leave some columns or rows blank? Presumably footnote 1 on Table 2 (the reference to the proposal narrative) will not apply here.

A19

- The first three PIM tables invite CRP contributions to CGIAR targets, flagship level outcomes (as declared by the CRP) and flagship-level investment by sub-IDOs. PIM table D will allow CRPs to identify major annual milestones and outcome reporting.
- Tables A-C are for the value for money analysis.
- Reporting on Table B and Table C may be similar, but the availability of Table B (CRP targeted outcomes) responds to the flexibility required by CRPs and point 1 of the question.
- Milestones by year will be captured in Table D.
- The table for the submission of the uplift budget is available with the budget tables here which further explains what is needed for that table and the PIM tables.

Q20 'The CRP V4M Narrative includes space for certain Key Activities such as gender, youth capdev, impact assessment, intellectual asset management, open access and data management and communication.' The narrative templates of the FPs (pages 53-55 of the call for proposal guideline document) also request descriptions of the same activities (gender, youth, open access, intellectual asset management, capacity development, communication). Can we eliminate the duplication by just referring in the budget sheets to the CRP and FP narratives?

A20 All CRPs should allocate amounts at the CRP level. However, some CRPs may have additional specific detail at the FP level and where CRP budget allocations are more than the simple sum of FP allocations to similar activities.

Q21 Section 1.10 (capdev): a template for a table to be included in this section is provided in the updated proposal outline. Since this section is one page only, do you expect any material in addition to the table in this section, or does this section only consist of the template?

A21 A CRP's work on CapDev can be articulated in a few areas in the full proposal including:

1. At CRP level - a one page narrative is expected and a template is available in the online submission tool to help fame this narrative around the 4 areas required.
2. At Flagship level - each FP can use up to 0.5 page for describing their key CapDev activities.
3. In the Annexes - a CapDev Strategy with fuller details of how CapDev will be carried out can be uploaded (up to 4 pages).
4. In the PIM Table 3 - FPs should be indicating their investment for cross-cutting topics including CapDev by sub-IDO.

CRPs are welcome -even encouraged- to mention CapDev in other sections of their proposal as appropriate.

Q22 Section 1.2: the guidance says "provide a table of the SRF SLOs and crosscutting IDOs being addressed". Does this information have to be in table format, or is it okay to have this information in a figure?

A22 We confirm that a table is requested. Other ways of setting out relationships of the goals, objectives and targets for the CRP could obviously be added, but the table is the most concise way of providing this information in the narrative section, and which should tally with the PIM tables and the quantification of targets.

Q23 Section 1.15: FAQ says "The template is unchanged from the pre-proposal request", but the pre-proposal did not include anything on risks. Please confirm there is no template.

A23 We agree that there were small sections and not a template in the pre-proposal. A template is not provided for the full proposal on this subject but CRPs should address risks and risk management in a maximum of 1 page.

Q24 The guidance says "ISPC requires proposals to include an attached document in which, i) the key issues raised by the ISPC at the pre-proposal stage are listed, ii) the actions taken to address them are presented, iii) any other significant changes since the pre-proposal stage are also listed (incorporations or exclusions). Space will be provided in the submission template for this attachment." Yet this annex is not mentioned anywhere in the template. Does this mean this document is not needed?

A24 There is a specific request for this annex by the ISPC. It is needed. It should be hyperlinked by proponents to the narrative at the appropriate place.

Q25 In PIM, at proposal stage gender is no longer a flagship. We understand that the tool will allow CRPs to edit flagship titles. Will it also allow CRPs to REMOVE flagships? (i.e submission not blocked because this "old" flagship has not been filled in).

A25 We confirm that flagship titles can be edited in the full proposal template. For CRPs who wish to delete flagships, the number and title of flagships should be communicated to the Consortium Office, preferably before the tool goes live at the end of February so that developers can enter the correct number of flagships and their titles into the tool.

Q26 There is no space for "geographies" within the templates besides the site integration part. We all recognize the importance of the 20 countries for site integration but we also do significant work in countries that are very significant players in the agricultural world: Indonesia, Brazil, China... Where can we therefore document the complete geographical spread of a CRP in the given templates?

A26 The identification of geographies in which the CRP will work is an important part of the rationale and scope of both the CRP and its component flagships. There is no separate table to discuss this perspective, but CRPs wanting to explain further the geographical emphases in the proposal should prepare such an annex and place it on a CRP or Center site so that it can be accessed through a hyperlink by the reviewers.

Q27 In the outline for FP, it is written "2.4: Science Quality - As in pre-proposal" Max- 2 pages text. As far as I recall there was no such section in the pre-proposal. Given that this is something the ISPC is likely to look at with great attention, can you give us more information about what would like to see in these 2 pages?

A27 It is likely that the reviewers would like to understand how the orientation of the program has been developed and targeted, with a convincing discussion of the CRP's comparative advantage; how hypotheses have been developed, and how research quality and continuing relevance will be managed and assessed by the program. It will extend to demonstration of quality in science management, linkages to appropriate additional sources of scientific advice, the existence of independent scientific advisory panels, and patterns of internal assessment, reflection and review.

Q28 Gender sections - What's the difference in what's requested in the 4-pages in the main document and the second part of the annex.

A28 Further to our response to Q9, which distinguishes the content of the two annexes, we stress that the 4 page Gender Annex in the full proposals is a request from Funders stipulated in the Fund Council Gender Monitoring Framework. The FC wants an analytical essay on how the gender research done in Phase 1 of the CRP has influenced the new proposal. It is an opportunity to inform our stakeholders in some depth, how the CRP has used gender research in the previous phase to inform and orient its science - and to be analytical about the challenges involved in doing this better. This is not an analysis to which you can devote much (if any) space in the full proposal.

The Gender Annex is therefore, a gift of extra space and as such, a fundraising opportunity. We would like to assure proposers of CRPs that the Gender Annex has a specific purpose and one that is not at all confusing to the FC members who requested it, some of whom include past performance on integration of gender into research priority setting as a criterion for their continued support.

Q29 If the level of budget detail requested for submissions is still required, can the language (in the Guidance) about prior clearance for variances from the budgets be removed?

A29 The Consortium Office considered the budget requirements in some detail and a meeting has been held between Albin Hubscher and the CSE. There is no problem in disregarding the 10% (USD 0.5million) variance request until such time as the final budgets are approved.

Q30 How to fill out the newly introduced partnership table?

A30 Following discussion with the ISPC the partnership table template accompanying the narrative partnership strategy will be changed (from the 4 modes of partnership table as per Annex 2 section 1.8) and replaced with the simplified table attached (see here). All other partnership tables (i.e. those for cross CRP partnerships and site integration remain unchanged). This new template will be a downloadable table to be filled in and reattached. The ISPC would like this to provide examples of strategic partnerships to support CRP and FP narratives on strategic partnerships as explained in the following description (that will also be found in the help section in relation to partnerships in the on-line tool).

"CRPs should fill in the partnership table as illustrative examples supporting the partnership strategy narrative. CRPs should provide 1 or 2 examples (not more) of partnership groupings relevant to different major outcomes at the CRP level, and 1 or 2 examples for each FP. Please label each table clearly with the CRP/FP titles, outcome pathway illustrated, and example number x. It is recognised that not all lines of the table may be filled depending upon the example. Each example should refer only to key strategic partners. Complete lists of partners are not required."

Q31 Re PIM Table D. Two main issues were brought up:

1. **Confusion about the link between milestones and outcomes**
2. **Excessive data entry for Table D**

A31 As to point 1, we would like to confirm that one milestone is linked only to one outcome and not to multiple outcomes.

As to point 2, we appreciate many of you will start working on XLS, so to reduce the workload of your team we have developed a template attached here which we ask you to use to add milestones per year, and select the outcome. You would first have to write the outcome description titles in the first worksheet, then these would appear in the drop-down of the 2nd worksheet.

The PIM Table D would allow a maximum of 150 milestones to be added per Flagship, and we added a maximum of 10 outcomes per Flagship too.

From the point of view of the tool, once CRPs fill this out, you can upload a file per Flagship, and the system will read the entries automatically without need for additional data entry.

Q32 Could it make more sense to describe a gender platform rather than have the system-wide gender function as one of the Policies, Institutions and Markets FPs (and thus alter the guidance to accommodate a new platform)?

A32 No, the Guidance stands and the system-wide gender function should be created as a new FP of PIM, FP 6. The title of this new FP should be provided to the on-line tool developers to be entered into the tool before it goes live.

Q33 PIM, Table A: The February 1 proposal outline doc states: "Enter the estimated amount of financial resources needed (for e.g. 10,000,000 for 10 million USD). Note that this amount should exclude crosscutting investments (capacity building, gender & youth, climate change, policies and institutions)." Why this exclusion? This does not seem useful for PIM, and this type of cross-cutting investments do contribute to the SLOs.

A33 This table seeks to establish the quantified contributions of CRPs to the CGIAR targets in the SRF, in the same units as the CGIAR targets, and is not measuring the dimensions of the enabling environment per se.

Q34 PIM, Table A: Where do we include explanations and assumptions used for estimating contribution to the SLO targets? In section 1.2? Will space be provided in the PIM Table A for these explanations? Or can we link to a separate document, or append such a document in the "free" annexes?

A34 It might be useful to link explanations to Sections 1.2 or 1.3. The "free" annex would also be appropriate if this subject is a major concern for the CRP.

Q35 Annex 3.2 on partnership strategy: The guidance refers to "strategic partners" as the small number of partners that have a role in CRP management, and with whom a PPA will be signed. Section iv of the partnership strategy, titled "Strategic partnership activities" (page 22 of the guidance), is clearly meant to encompass activities with other partners than just the "strategic partners" as defined above. To avoid confusion, we suggest to rename section iv of the partnership strategy. An alternative would be to change the term "strategic partners" for "key partners".

A35 If the demarcation of what is required in the Guidance is clear, and we agree with your understanding, no change is proposed. Please also see the response to Q30.

Q36 Annex 3.3 on capacity development strategy: Do we need to provide the details of the capacity building budget?

A36 We request that bottom line figures for the CRP are provided in the narrative, and CRP and FP budgets for capacity development are given in the section of the budget template identified for this purpose.

Q37 Flagship uplift budgets: are the amounts by 2022 outcome annual or for 6 years?

A37 Six year totals.

Q38 What is a CGIAR strategic competitive research grant, p39?

A38 A strategic competitive research Grant is a call for proposal issued by the CRP leader for a specific piece of research/work required within the CRP.

Q39 Do we need an IDO listing in narrative as well as PIM tables?

A39 The reviewers will be looking for some declaration up front in the narrative that "This CRP contributes to these sub-IDOs (both SLO and cross-cutting)". It is part of framing the intent of the program for the reviewers. It could best be done in a simple table. It does not have budget details. The PIM tables are declaring substantially more information (different outcome targets under one SLO) and budget information needed for the Value for money analysis which is not the intent of the orientating, introductory narrative. That is why we said that they were not the same thing but should align. In summary, the first table is really only a listing to go with the intro narrative. The PIM tables are separate.

Q40 Do we need to fill in both partnership tables?

A40 Yes please (and also see CRP correspondence in relation to table 2b on site integration).

Q41 Where do references / bibliographies go? It would seem that these would count toward our word limit, but we haven't yet seen a section. Do they go at the end of the narrative or in an "Other tables" annex?

A41 We did not create any sections for references / bibliographies in the template, however CRPs or Platforms can use the 'Annex - Other annexes' section to upload this or any other additional information.

Q42 Tables don't count toward page limits, but does the text in the tables count?

A42 Text in tables are not counted against the quota per page. More here about the online editor: http://online-submission-tool-support.cgxchange.org/home/explore-the-online-tool

Q43 Is submission deadline March 31st midnight local time or UTC/GMT?

A43 Submission deadline is Thursday, 31 March at 17:00 Mexico city time.

Q44 "The CRP should demonstrate that budgets allocated for CapDev have a credible share of the total CRP budget (eg. totaling around 10% although amounts may vary in individual flagships."

Please correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that budget allocation for cross-cutting activities including CapDev, Gender and Youth comes from W1-2 (barring the instances where there are specific W3 or bilateral funds earmarked for these).

So, in a CRP where 10% of the total budget is lesser than or equal to W1-2 allocation, how can we allocate that entire 10% to CapDev?

A44 The subject of capacity building, like gender, is of particular concern to donors who wish to see not just descriptions of activities but adequate resources committed to these two cross-cutting areas, i.e. the amount identified for Capacity Development should average (at least) 10% irrespective of the source of funding.

Q45 Site integration - to what extent can we use standardized reporting for site integration, e.g. uploading a generic file?

A45 The major consideration for the reviewers will be to see how site integration is to be handled from the perspective of an individual CRP, and they will also want to read through as much joined up text as possible. We therefore recommend that individual CRPs describe what the system-wide efforts in site integration mean for their program in the period of the full proposal, and not provide generic text.

Q46 The proposal guidance states that the CVs reflecting expertise on the management team and flagship projects should be included in Annex 3.8. The ISPC has indicated that it is fine to instead link to CVs placed in a Dropbox or website. We find the latter more appropriate since it decreases the length of the proposals which will be printed, and allows for easier referencing of CVs by flagship.

A46 Firstly, a template for CVs has been provided and it will be helpful if that template was used to allow comparability. It will be possible to link the information to an external site or Dropbox; however, that linker should be provided as a statement in Annex 3.8 of where the information can be found. CRPs may also use templates in Annex 3.8 as originally indicated.

Q47 How are we supposed to reconcile a 0.5 page about communication strategy (section 1.14) with the about 3 pages of guidance about communication in the guidance document?

A47 There are places where the guidance is expanded to help CRP leaders think about the dimensions of an issue in planning for the CRP (site integration, and IA and OD/OA in the on-line help sections are other examples). The request for the CRP proposal submission still stands at 0.5 page for communications. If the CRP has a more substantial strategy or would like to describe dimensions of an approach beyond this, it is suggested that such an explanatory document should be placed on the CRP website and hyperlinked to the 0.5 page summary. This addition would be the choice of the CRP and is not obligatory.

Q48 Flagship budget narrative - In section 1 of the flagship budget narrative ("Summary"), in the second table (Total Flagship budget by Natural Classification (USD)), the category "CGIAR collaboration" seems to be missing. How should we handle this? Can you please provide a corrected template?

A48 We see that the category 'CGIAR Collaboration' is indeed missing from the Word template; however, it is captured in the online tool:

Total Flagship budget by Natrual Classifications

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	TOTAL
Personnel	2,872,521	2,972,885	3,077,062	3,185,208	3,297,487	3,414,069	18,819,232
Travel	114,508	114,508	124,508	134,508	134,508	134,508	757,046
Capital Equipment	70,000	70,000	50,000	30,000	0	0	220,000
Other Supplies and Services	1,789,725	1,789,725	1,789,725	1,789,725	1,789,725	1,789,725	10,738,352
CGIAR collaboration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non CGIAR collaboration	765,723	765,723	765,723	775,723	795,723	795,723	4,664,338
Indirect Cost	656,069	669,208	681,351	694,020	704,234	719,518	4,124,400
	6,268,546.18	6,382,049.04	6,488,369.1	6,609,183.58	6,721,677.36	6,853,543.49	39,323,368.75

Total Flagship budget by participating partners (signed PPAs) (USD)

We hope this relieves the concern, given the form in Word will have to be filled out in the tool, and that value in particular is captured automatically from the excel budget.

Q49 CapDev Template

1. **The guidance says “1 page using the template”. Does this mean that in total it should not exceed 4k characters?**
2. **Is there a limit to how many characters can be entered into a single cell in the template?**
3. **Is there any other way to fill the template than cut and paste?**
4. **Capacity to Innovate is NOT one of the 9 elements in the framework, yet in the template it is listed as a 10th. The Framework document identifies it as part of the 'jump' the framework is aiming for in understanding capdev within CRPs as contributing to this system level outcome. Do we need to consider this element a swell in our submission?**

A49

1. Ideally, the entire form should not have more than 4k characters all together, but this form is a bit more flexible in terms of allowing more if needed; however, please try to keep the points short.
2. No limit, however as you can see the boxes are not that big. This is intentional so the responses are not so long. Remember you also have a 4-page annex for Capacity Development strategy which can be used to further expand the concepts.
3. You can also write in the text directly in each field if you do not want to copy and paste.
4. You are right that Capacity to Innovate is NOT one of the (9) elements and should be something that helps all CapDev work—as this was in fact a key part added to the Framework document by colleagues at WorldFish. However, to be able to see what explicit activities, indicators and budget CRPIIs would put against this, it has been treated as one of the elements for the proposal template.
   As with all 9 or 10 elements, there is a choice of which ones the CRPIIs will focus on and with what intensity. It is therefore up to each CRPII how they plan to include, -or not include their work on this aspect in their CRP proposal submission.

Online Submission Tool

A support site for the online submission tool is being developed, and will be officially launched on 1st of March. You can however, already access it to answer questions on how to fill the PIM tables and some online tool FAQs: https://sites.google.com/a/cgxchange.org/online-submission-tool-support/.

Q1 How are the page limits imposed; hard cut off?

A1 Yes, if the page limit is exceeded - when you try and save you get an error and invited to reduce the length.

Q2 Are the characters in a table counted in the total page limit of a section?

A2 Table characters are not counted in the quota of a section page limit.

Q3 Does the system auto save as you work, in case the internet disconnects?

A3 There is no auto-save, but there are save buttons in every section as well as at the bottom of the page – we advise to save often.

Q4 Is there a deadline to consolidate the budget?

A4 The deadline to submit proposals in the online tool is 31 March, 2016, so this would be the same deadline to submit budgets. The online submission tool will be available to start the submission process on 1 March.

Q5 When are we going to receive the final budget templates?

A5 The CO has already (week of Jan 25) provided the directors of corporate services with access. Templates are available here; they are applicable equally to CRPs full proposals and Platforms.

Q6 Should management costs be capitalized when costing outcomes, or should this be separate?

A6 No, management costs should be considered as operational and included as a cost contributing to CRPs' outcomes.

Q7 Will the CRP leader receive an email or log of activity in regards to their CRP submission?

A7 The online submission tool will have a general audit log. Notification by mail will not be sent to the person responsible for submitting each time a change is made.

Q8 Are you using the Flagship titles from the pre-proposal?

A8 The online submission tool provides a pre-filled list of titles for the Flagships taken from the pre-proposals. However, CRPs will be able to edit the Flagship titles in the tool.

Q9 Who will be given access to the online submission tool?

A9 There will be roles: contributors and one authorized submitter. Each CRP will have to decide who they want to give access to. If the CRP wants to give access to the Flagship leaders to submit their Flagship information, this is technically feasible. We would need the list of people authorized per CRP. It is important to highlight however, that this is a submission tool and not a collaboration tool. This means that changes made by someone to a section will be lost after another person saves, so it is important to ensure that those with access do have the authority to change the content assigned to them. From a process perspective it is suggested that CRPs agree to the majority of the proposal content with their collaborators using other collaboration tools (Google Docs, SharePoint, Wikis), and have only a smaller set of staff authorized to access the online submission tool. Only one person will be authorized to submit.

Q10 Will there then be additional training sessions?

A10 A first session to preview the features and progress of the online submission tool was held in January with a small group of CRP/Platform staff. A new session will be held and open to CRP/Platform staff in mid-February. Once the tool is ready for use, end-user guides and some short help videos will be shared with CRPs and Platform submitters. Additional virtual sessions can be organized if needed.

Q11 Can you generate a pdf from the tool?

A11 Yes, the tool can generate a PDF of the final document, and for checking before submission.

Q12 Is it possible to revoke access to the online tool once information has been input, so for example once we go into the final editing only selected people have access?

A12 Yes, you can manage access rights to your CRP at any stage of the process.

Q13 Are hyperlinks maintained when you copy and paste into a section?

A13 Yes, links and tables are maintained and can be copy pasted from Word. Images need to be uploaded in the online tool; not copy/pasted. This applies equally to CRP full proposals and Platforms.

Q14 Can you please clarify what is the preferred format for the staff CVs?

A14 We are looking for a 1-page Bio. A suggested template is provided with the complete set of draft templates here.

Q15 Will there be a template on risk management?

A15 The template is unchanged from the pre-proposal request.

Q16 Partnerships: which categorization shall be followed? Same as pre-proposals?

A16 A table has been made available to guide categorization of partners (see complete set of templates here).

Q17 Who is consolidating the engagements so far and coordination of development of new plans?

A17 There are lead Centers for site integration countries. Templates are available here under the title of 'Annex 3.7 Linkages with other CRPs and site integration', to help reporting.

Q18 When people copy paste, does the editor re-format everything in Calibri 11?

A18 CRPs are advised to write the proposal in Calibri 11, and use this font and size when copy and pasting to ensure the final PDF looks consistent with the guidelines.

Q19 Are footnotes copied over from Word in the online tool editor?

A19 Yes, we see they are copied over in each section when you paste from Word.

Q20 Annexes – are there limitations in terms of types of files in the Annexes?

A20 Not technically. The indicated limit however is normally 4 pages.

Q21 Who does this tool help?

A21 This tool helps ensure all CRP II phase submissions are consistent with the guidelines requirements. The tool will also facilitate the review of the proposals by the ISPC and the Consortium Office's value-for-money analysis across the portfolio. Our focus on providing these FAQs is in relation to the submission of full proposals in 2016. In the future, the tool may also be expanded, e.g. for CRPs to report to the System Office (TBC).

Q22 In reference to the uplift budget, should'nt W3 and Bilateral be together?

A22 No, the uplift budget response required is very simple, but the need is to establish the sources of funding in all categories.

Q23 In regards to table 1 of the PIM (CRP Level- 2022 CGIAR Targets). What happens if we exceed the targets or don't reach them?

A23 The table essentially frames the ambition of the CRP in contributing to the CGIAR targets. We hope the CRPs will do this on a rational basis, using whatever prior programmatic or scientific evidence is available to support these claims. We think it would be very helpful if CRPs discussed target-setting and the scientific underpinnings of targets together, before submission of the full proposals in March. However, it is also understood that these are the best estimates at the time of submission and that the rate of progress towards achievement of targets may be accelerated or slowed over the six year timeframe. The rate of progress, successes and constraints would be explained through annual reporting, and presumably retargeting by program management in the future. For the proposals, we are seeking clear statements of targets backed by the best current rationale.

Q24 Will all sub-IDOs be shown in Table C of the PIM?

A24 Yes, all 45 Sub-IDOs, including the cross-cutting ones will appear in the drop-down list.

Q25 Will the platforms have to fill out the PIM?

A25 Platforms will be judged on services and outputs. They should have a clear idea of which outcomes they are contributing to, but it is the CRP that will identify outcome targets and costs, i.e. there is no PIM for platforms.

Q26 Access to the tool – can we have 2-3 people in parallel accessing the tool when submitting?

A26 ADDENDUM – we have altered this response: The response now reads: The tool no longer allows for co-editing as we had once said. Only one person at a time can edit the tool, although more than one person can have a username. They will have to take turns to edit the submission. The encouragement to save regularly still applies.

Q27 What is the tool development deadline?

A27 The tool will be launched on 1 March. CRPs will have until 31 March to submit. We will have a phase where we will carry out a full test of the tool in February. Charlotte Lusty (Genebanks) volunteered to test the Platforms sections, Dagmar Wittine (RTB) and CCAFS to test for the CRPs.

Q28 If the tool does not work, is there a plan B?

A28 Yes, asking CRPs to submit by email. However, we do not expect to go this route.

Q29 Question about "pages" - would it not be more straightforward to put a word limit?

A29 The page limit was indicated in the Guidance. The system however, calculates the number of characters - max 4,000 per page including spaces, footnotes and references) - characters in the tables and images are not counted.

Q30 How do we handle annexes to sections? Also, how to handle list if references? Are these counted in the word count?

A30 Annexes can be added in the Annex section.

Q31 In the budgeted costs for certain key activities in the CRP budget narrative, will those totals be checked against the FP totals that appear in Table C of the PIM Tables for the cross-cutting issues like capdev and gender? Which one will be assessed for V4M, for example, if there's a difference?

A31 No there is no validation against the FP total of table C, this is a re-statement. Please check the FAQ which states Re: Q17.4 Budgets for individual sections/activities like capacity development, etc. will not be part of roll-up tables, but will be stated in narratives and again in section 6 of the CRP proposal budget narrative (Annex 3.1 in the guidance), and in section 4 of the Flagship proposal narrative (Annex 3.2 in the guidance) as appropriate.

Q32 Does the system save as you work? What happens if your wifi disconnects as you are entering info in a complex table?

A32 The system does not have an autosave, but there are save buttons in each section and at the bottom of the page, we recommend you save often while working.

Q33 Have you shared any excel/word template for the PIM while you make the Online Submission Tool available?

A33 Templates have been provided to CRP leaders and are included in the FAQs.

Q34 Is "other annexes" fully open?

A34 Any type of files can be added in the 'Other Annex' section.

Q35 Are these the confirmed sections that we will need to fill in? Or is it just a mock up example, pending confirmation?

A35 We do not expect new sections will be introduced.

Q36 Can people work in different sections at the same time?

A36 Multiple users can view at the same time but only one can edit at the time. This will be controlled with a 'Edit' and 'Release' function in the system.

Q37 Can pictures be uploaded in any format?

A37 Yes, pictures copied from Word can be copied and pasted. The system supports the upload / pasting of images from most commons formats: JPG, GIF.

Q38 Where can we add gender cross-cutting activities and budgets?

A38 See A7. Gender budget should be reported as a bottom line in the gender narrative section and CRP and flagship level budgets reported in the appropriate lines of the budget (section 5 of Annex 3.1 / section 4 of Annex 3.2).

Q39 Budget upload – IMPORTANT further instructions

A39 When uploading the final Flagship project in the online tool, it is important to select the '**Consolidated Flagship**' option under the '**GENERAL INFORMATION - – How are you using this template**' prior to upload, otherwise the online tool will give an error.

Q40 Budget narrative - The Guidance document, Annex 2 section 1.16 reads: "Budget narrative summary. Fill out the CRP budget narrative template. Max 1 page text." There are several sections to the CRP-level budget narrative. Does the 1 page max limit apply to each section or is it 1 page in total across all sections combined?

A40 The online tool technically accepts up to 4 pages in each Budget narrative box; however, we suggest not to exceed 1/2 page (2000 characters) in each box.

Q41 Can I copy and paste text boxes from Word in the Editor'

A41 No, text boxes are not always copied over. If you want to copy text boxes, please save them as images and insert them in the online tool editor.

Q42 Is it necessary to input the section title (e.g. 1.4 Gender) or will the online tool generate it automatically?

A42 The online tool will generate it automatically when generating the full proposal document, so there is no need to write in the decimals. If you have sub-sections in a section, you can number them if you'd like following the numbering in the 'Styles' document file, or just write sub-titles (ideally with no Styles from Word). See: Style-for CRPs - submission.docx and Style-for Platforms submission.docx