

Site Integration Plan by 30 April 2016 – How do we go about it?

A few opening thoughts:

1. **'Site integration'** does not primarily refer to **'sites'**; it actually refers to some form of integration of CGIAR R4D and non-CGIAR R4D/agri/rural development activities **within countries** (e.g from exchanging information to coordinating to doing things jointly). Site Integration operates at country level; however within a country there could be opportunities for site integration in some selected areas. *PS: CRP Leaders aim to agree on a more suitable term in June 2016 (problem is, it's in the SRF doc).*
2. A sustained **mechanism for integration** requires on-going **dialogue** and engagement with partners and stakeholders. **Aligning** CGIAR research activities with the national and regional (e.g. CAADP) strategic plans takes time and effort.
3. **Resources and incentives:** incentives are for CRPs and Centers to be engaged in Site Integration Planning. It is a requirement for Full Proposals; Huge opportunity for enhancing legitimacy;
4. **Donors' expectations:** Many donors have clearly stated that this is an important element in Phase II for them. Their logic: \$1 from CRP A aligned with \$1 from CRP B is more than \$2 & multiply the effect of \$1 research dollar, by leveraging it with scaling-out investments. Thus, donors will be tracking progress (as well at next Fund Council 4-5 May).

Some references to "site integration" in the SRF:

1. Develop **Site Integration Plans** to bring together work of CGIAR Centers and Programs in key countries, where CGIAR innovations are expected to reach millions of people.
2. Devise plans for assessing **impact**, the CRPs will consult with representatives of partners and beneficiary groups in **key countries** where they aim to deliver outcomes at scale.
3. The CRPs' collective, coordinated commitments in these geographies will be summarized in **Site Integration Plans** to enable transparent interaction with local stakeholders.

How do we develop the Site Integration Plan?

1. By end this month, each Lead Center per country, with the help of all Center/CRP focal points, needs to **show how far they've gotten per country to develop a plan** and **what remains to be done**, to agree a plan, which can then be implemented over time. Of course, one country consultation meeting does not result in a final plan.
2. Focus should be on CGIAR/national aligning and shared research agendas. It's okay to state that looking at intra-CGIAR efficiencies remains a To Do. We can't work on everything at the same time.
3. Explain how you will set up a smaller group in 2016, including national partners and Centers/CRPs, to move forward and by when you expect to have a site integration plan endorsed by all stakeholders, with enough budget to start on implementation, in 2017. Also sketch how the smaller group will consult more widely in 2016.
4. Currently there are no set funds for Site Integration, some CRPs have put 'coordination time/effort' into the Phase II uplift budget. Therefore, clearly budgeting for the 'ongoing dialogue' and for some concrete fruits during 2017-19, in terms starting to implement a 'collaborative research agenda', are important. Estimate as best you can, or state it remains as To Do.

Suggested Template for the Site Integration Plan

This “template guide” does not replace the 10 elements for site integration earlier shared by Nadia. It does however provide a framework within which the elements can be presented. There are two Tables at the end of the document. These Tables are intended to crystallize the issues. They could be used in a flexible fashion, either to supplement the narrative, or in some cases used in lieu of detailed narrative. This is left to the respective focal points to decide what is most relevant in their case. Not all the slots would have information to fill the table at this point in time. . If something has not yet been agreed CG-internally and/or with national partners, state this (e.g. ongoing).

The template is presented below with some suggestions on what the content could be. This is

A. Introduction:

- Brief intro on the place and importance of agriculture in the context of the particular country.
- Brief insight on the CGIAR presence in the country (in terms of numbers of Centers and CRPs functioning within the country, and working in partnership with country institutions)
- Short piece on ‘Big Picture’: CGIAR SRF, link to SDGs, how site integration fits into this (will be more or less same text for all countries).

You can either develop narrative for the next sections, or fill in 2 tables at bottom

B. Objectives and Goals for Site Integration: Describe what has been developed, agreed CG-internally, with national partners. Focus on top priority foundational objectives, and indicate the other possibilities later. For comparability, we suggest you use these terms:

1. **Alignment with national (and regional) strategic plans** (priorities and actions) for agriculture and national development.
2. Establishing a sustained mechanism for **coordination among CGIAR parties** functioning within a particular country.
3. Exploring opportunities for **collaborative research agendas** in a coordinated manner, linking CGIAR parties with national systems. This objective deals with collaboration in projects. Also includes possible linkage into major donor and investment programs in the country.
4. **Enhanced efficiencies of operation** of CGIAR entities within country. This could include sharing facilities; establishing joint mechanisms; etc.

C. Expected Outcomes: This section should be realistic and clear. By 2020 (in 5 years), what do we, CGIAR partners, plan to deliver as outcomes, together with national partners?

What will have changed due to successful site integration plan implementation?

- a. A - Best to match this to the 4 genetic objectives in section B
- b. B
- c. C

D. Strategic Interventions for realizing the outcomes. How are we going to get there? Most practical to describe interventions (e.g. activities that take ½ year or more end-to-end, on which future further activities would build) for each of the four objectives in section B:

a. **Alignment with national strategic plan**

- i. Intervention 1
- ii. Intervention 2

iii. Intervention x

b. **Coordination among CGIAR parties**

- i. Intervention 1
- ii. Intervention 2
- iii. Etc., etc.

c. **Collaborative research agendas**

- i. Intervention 1
- ii. Intervention 2
- iii. Intervention x

d. **Enhanced efficiencies of operation** of CGIAR Centers

- i. Intervention 1
- ii. Intervention x

- E. Who will take responsibility for what? - Sharing key responsibilities among partners:
This needs to build upon existing capacities for different Centers and what roles can be played by who as a basis for site integration.
- F. Organizing and Steering planning and implementation:
- a. Describe CG-internal coordination set-up
 - b. Describe National-CGIAR working group set up (the smaller group that drives the process forward); it can be about existing national coordination mechanisms, no need to re-invent the wheel;
 - c. Describe how wider consultation (e.g. with more types of stakeholders, more organizations/people, less frequently) will be organized and for what purpose (e.g. everybody informed, connect people/institutions, get implementation partners for interventions, etc.).
- G. Budgets:
- a. Describe how CGIAR partners and national partners will fund activities in 2016. You can mention constraints.
 - b. Show what CRPS have planned in their Full Proposals for 2017 onwards, even if not very specific; if this has not been done, indicate as a To Do. Same for national partners' side: What should, or are, they aiming for in terms of co-funding?
- H. Conclusions:

Site Integration Plan Overview

<i>COUNTRY</i>		
	Current	Planned (by end 2016)
Lead Center	<i>Center / Name</i>	<i>Put info only if appropriate</i>
Participating CRPs, Centers	<i>Total no, list</i>	<i>More Centers, CRPs?</i>
Intra-CG coordination team	<i>Briefly describe; fully set up, who leads/chairs, clear ToRs, meets how often?</i>	
National-CGIAR working group	<i>See above</i>	
All Stakeholder forum	<i>See above, this is about national coordination meeting, wider consultation ...; what format, frequency</i>	
National stakeholders engaged		
Government incl national funding agencies	<i>Total no, list, e.g. MoA, ATA You don't have</i>	<i>Any new ones being 'recruited'?</i>
Public sector research	<i>e.g. NARS, university/faculty</i>	
Public sector along value chain	<i>e.g. Ethiopian Seed Enterprises</i>	
Public sector regional	<i>e.g. ASARECA, COMESA</i>	
Farmer orgs	<i>e.g. Farmers Union, Cooperative</i>	
Private sector along value chain	<i>e.g. Private seed business, business associations</i>	
NGOs	<i>e.g. Catholic Relief East Africa</i>	
Regional, International Funding agencies	<i>e.g. USAID Ethiopia, World Bank Ethiopia,</i>	
Budget (Resources)		
2016 CGIAR	<i>Who is putting up budget for what?</i>	<i>NA</i>
2016 National partners	<i>Any contributions, in-kind or other, by whom, for what?</i>	
2017 CGIAR	<i>What have CRPs put into Full Proposal? Part of core or uplift budget? Specific figure per country?</i>	
2017 national partners		<i>Any contributions, in-kind or other, by whom, for what?</i>

Progress towards Site Integration Plan: COUNTRY

[illegible]

[illegible]