

CGIAR Fund Council Meeting

22-23 February Brussels, Belgium

Agenda Item

Work Plan and Budget for 2010 of the interim Independent Science and Partnership Council.

The interim Independent Science and Partnership Council presents a Work Plan and Budget for 2010 and seeks Fund Council endorsement for the outline plan and proposed budget of USD 3.572 million.

The document presents the transition from the Science Council (with a report on the completion of SC activities in the last biennium) and the interpretation of the new mandate of the ISPC. These represent a mixture, in the transitional year of 2010, of continuing and new functions. However the Work plan is developed in the context of the 2010/2011 biennium and places emphasis on iISPC activities with an anticipated enlargement of impact assessment activities, science foresight and the mobilization of science. The basic Science Council structure is maintained in 2010. Only an incremental increase in Council costs is anticipated in accordance with experience of 2009, and there is a reduction in Secretariat costs in the transitional year.

The activities and nominal budget for the functioning ISPC in 2011 will be further discussed by the interim ISPC at its meeting in April 2010, and with CGIAR stakeholders. A new ISPC Work Plan and Budget for 2011 will be proposed for the confirmation of the Fund Council in mid-2010. A newly constituted ISPC will implement that new WorkPlan from 2011.



CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

WORK PLAN & BUDGET for 2010

of the

interim INDEPENDENT SCIENCE & PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL (iISPC)

(2nd February 2010)

Summary

It is a time of change in the CGIAR. The Science Council (SC) will transform into an Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) with modified Terms of Reference and structure.

The transition to the ISPC will be a staged process. In 2010 an interim ISPC (iISPC) will take on a number of continuing and transitional roles whilst planning for the full implementation of the ISPC in 2011.

In 2010 therefore, the interim ISPC will maintain the structure and make-up of the SC in 2009. During 2010, the interim Council will plan the full work program of the ISPC for 2011 and together with the Fund Council will reformulate the membership and the Council's skills in line with the identified tasks. The newly formulated ISPC will take up the Work plan in 2011.

The interim ISPC presents a Work plan and Budget for both continuing transitional and new activities in 2010 budgeted at USD 3.572 million, the same as in 2009. However the Work plan places emphasis on iISPC activities with an anticipated enlargement of impact assessment activities, science foresight and the mobilization of science. Only an incremental increase in Council costs is anticipated in accordance with experience of 2009, and there is a reduction in Secretariat costs in the transitional year.

The activities and nominal budget for the functioning ISPC in 2011 will be further discussed by the interim ISPC at its meeting in April 2010, and with CGIAR stakeholders. A new ISPC Work Plan and Budget for 2011 will be proposed for the confirmation of the Fund Council in mid-2010.

I. INTRODUCTION

The originally mandated functions of the Science Council (SC) have been: (i) quality control, monitoring the work of the CGIAR Centers and programs and to strengthen and extend their impact; (ii) formulation of CGIAR System priorities and research strategies; and (iii) helping mobilize scientific linkages to extend support to the CGIAR research program and the constituency of the CGIAR.

Accordingly, the SC has provided leadership and support to the CGIAR in four broad areas: identifying system research priorities; improving monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (MTPs, EPMRs, CPERs, and the PMS); promoting an impact oriented culture in the CGIAR; and, organizing activities related to mobilizing science, e.g., the Science Forum 2009. Additional specific studies have been carried out on the context of CGIAR research, notably, for intellectual property concerns, ethics, biofuels, biosafety, and most recently on social science capacity, which are central to the development of updated policies for the Centers and the CGIAR as a whole.

Working through a panel arrangement, with regular meetings and with support of the full time Science Council Secretariat good progress was made in completing the planned 2008-2009 Work plan and encompassing additional activities (summarized in Annex I and in tabular format in Annex II).

1.1 Mode of operation in 2004 - 2009

The SC consisted of a Chair and seven Members (six members and the ex officio Chair of SPIA). The Council has held two meetings annually (generally at CGIAR Centers), making decisions in open sessions. During the first four years of operation, SC activities were organized under four Panels (Monitoring & Evaluation, Impact Assessment, Priorities & Strategies and Mobilizing Science). Each Panel was formed with two SC members and two Panel members. The impact assessment group has one SC Member as an independent Chair, plus two Panel members.

The Panels for Monitoring & Evaluation and Impact Assessment have continued to function through to the present. During the last biennium, Priorities & Strategies and Mobilizing Science became portfolios of the whole SC with Council members appointed with particular responsibility for acting as focal points for these portfolios.

The SC Secretariat, based at FAO, has provided technical and administrative support to the SC, implementing its decisions and following up with all related technical activities. Professional Officers of the Secretariat provide technical support to working groups, task forces and panels, and have assisted in the reviews of Medium Term Plans, External Reviews, information management, meeting preparation and follow up of recommendations, special projects (including desk research and literature surveys, analyses and synthesis) and other Council-wide activities. The

staffing of the Secretariat (as planned for 2009) was an Executive Director (D2-level), 6 professionals (4 Seniors and 2 Juniors) and 5 administrative staff. However, with the departure of the Executive Director in March 2009 and a junior officer in January 2009, and with the new Director post (at the D1 level) still under competitive international recruitment, the Secretariat has been understaffed for much of the year.

II. THE ENVISAGED CHANGE TO THE INDEPENDENT SCIENCE AND PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL (ISPC)

The new CGIAR calls for an ISPC as a standing body to provide advice and support to the Fund Council and Funders' Summit and to advise the Consortium Board and the global agricultural scientific community.

The agreed functions of the ISPC as described in the summary report to ExCo, CGIAR November 2009 (see Annex III) are:

1. Commission and oversee evaluations of the scientific quality, relevance, partnership arrangements and likely development effectiveness of the investment proposals submitted by the Consortium to the Fund Council and make recommendations concerning their investment worthiness.
2. In undertaking the role described in 1 above, the ISPC will also provide feedback and guidance to the Consortium on any areas of concern regarding the quality of the proposed research and partnership arrangements contained in submitted investment proposals and on any deficiencies in the ex ante impact assessments provided by the Consortium in support of them.
3. Provide the Fund Council and the Funders Forum with foresight advice on trends and emerging issues, as well as potential strategies of addressing them related to the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework. In undertaking this role the ISPC will act as commissioner and coordinator of any required foresight studies, drawing on expertise within the Consortium and beyond, as appropriate, to undertake them.
4. To complement the GCARD process, in consultation and partnership with the Consortium and GFAR, convene periodic high-level scientific dialogues on high priority issues that will inform the scientific deliberations among CGIAR scientists and their research partners and help catalyze partnerships of the CGIAR with other global science communities.
5. Improve strategic investment decisions and help increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment studies within the CGIAR by commissioning, in partnership with the Consortium, ex-post impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments. The evaluation of the Mega Programs and system review will be undertaken by an independent evaluation arrangement, which will in turn avail itself of the lessons learnt from the ISPC's work.
6. Provide the Fund Council with independent advice on other matters upon request.

The interim ISPC interprets these roles under four headings:

1. Promote the quality and relevance of science programs in relation to goals and objectives of the new CGIAR through independent program review, particularly:

- Undertake assessment and scientific review of MegaProgram or other investment proposals;
- Analyze M&E results from specific research programs to provide synthesized advice to funders;
- Contribute to the development of analytical methods, tools and approaches in the formulation of research priorities and assessment of the potential impacts of new proposed investments.

2. Contribute through foresight studies to defining strategic directions for the CGIAR System

- Conduct foresight studies and analyze emerging issues with the objective of quantifying the research challenge and the potential impact in response to opportunities and needs identified by ISPC and other stakeholders;
- Mobilize the science community on high priority issues to contribute to the scientific deliberations of the Consortium and its partners;
- Provide input to the development of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF).

3. Mobilize science and promote effective partnerships

- Search for new advanced science opportunities, beyond the current scope, to address research problems related to the System objectives;
- Develop strategic thinking on effective partnerships in the R&D continuum to enhance the organizational relevance, effectiveness, and global impact of agricultural science to meet developmental goals;
- Evaluate the added value of current partnership arrangements and incentive modalities as part of MegaProgram assessment with emphasis on improving the utility and impact of research outputs.

4. Ensure accountability on overall System impact

- Provide evidence on the effectiveness of research investments through *ex-post* impact assessment of system programs;
- Increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment studies on program areas and system wide activities;
- Facilitate impact assessment activities on crosscutting issues such as partnerships, capacity building, diversity, gender and any other relevant ones that may emerge;
- Contribute towards improved strategic decisions by improving feedback of impact assessment results and by enhancing the rigor of trend and foresight analysis;
- Support, through appropriate collaborative mechanisms, stakeholder accountability fora that will contribute to the assessment of the effectiveness of the CGIAR in meeting developmental objectives.

The ISPC will principally provide support in the form of analyses and detailed recommendations to the Fund Council (and Funders' Summit) and provide advice to the Consortium Board.

The transition to the ISPC will be a staged process. In 2010 an interim ISPC will be formed which will take on a number of continuing and transitional roles whilst planning for the full implementation of the ISPC in 2011.

In 2010 therefore, the iISPC will maintain the structure and make-up of the SC in 2009. During 2010, the interim Council will plan the full work program of the ISPC for 2011 and together with the CGIAR Fund Council will reformulate the membership and ISPC's skills in line with the identified tasks.

III. A WORK PLAN FOR THE ISPC 2010-2011

A proposed Work plan for the iISPC in 2010 combines continuing and transitional activities and new alignment with a view to anticipated activities in 2011. In some cases these can be quite well defined, in other cases definition of plans in 2011 will require completion of, amongst other things, a final SRF and MegaProgram portfolio and stakeholder meetings. Because there is a blend of some residual activities and new activities in 2010, the work is presented under four headings. There is an increased emphasis on Impact Assessment functions and a reduced set of activities with respect to Monitoring and Evaluation in line with the transition. Activity costs, in square brackets, are given in USD. A summary can be found in Section IV, Table 2.

3.1 Strategy and Trends

This topic is placed first in this document, although the subject matter is somewhat tentative at this stage, as a major role of the new ISPC will be to contribute to strategic foresight studies. As noted, the choice of studies will depend upon a mixture of factors including emerging trends, the final form of the SRF and lacunae in any developing portfolio of CGIAR research as well as identification of key requirements that the Consortium itself cannot undertake. As previously, the ISPC intends to take an independent and system-level view of trends and scientific opportunities. Studies involving the derivation of new data (c.f. desk studies) must be appropriately budgeted. The first part of the iISPC's agenda will be to flesh out the work in this area through consultations with stakeholders. It is probable with time that the ISPC's work on strategic issues will be complemented by its mobilization of science around the same subject areas. However, in 2010 new and continuing activities include:

3.1.1. Stakeholder consultation on key trend analyses and presentation of ISPC outputs

The iISPC will arrange electronic consultations and a face to face process with key stakeholders as part of its first meeting in 2010 to confirm a high priority short-list of

analyses required by the Fund Council and the CGIAR at large and which are within the comparative advantage of the ISPC (*per se* or through the independent commissioning of studies, models etc). This interaction is expected to be relevant to the ISPC portfolio of activities in general although placed under this heading for descriptive purposes. [15,000]

3.1.2. Achieving impact at scale from natural resources management (NRM) research

The team charged with the development of the Strategic Results Framework for the new CGIAR has applied analytical procedures in the formulation of research for development priorities that might be addressed in the new CGIAR portfolio. However, the models used tend to be strong on factors directly impacting production but weak on the natural resource system contexts in which this production has to be achieved. Studies by the SC/SPIA so far have noted relatively low or project-specific impacts to NRM research conducted by the CGIAR. Current work is looking at the systems impacts of agricultural innovation. To support priority setting and especially to address research needs in times of changing climates there is a need to have better understanding of entire production systems - both agricultural production and the environmental systems within which they are located. This will be fundamental to achieving impacts at scale in different systems under changed climates. Such systems understanding will be essential to achieve the SRF goals of enhancing the resilience of farming systems. This study will therefore examine the needs and implications for the CGIAR and its partners of conducting research on the NRM systems in which production occurs as a basis for achieving scalable impacts. The study will be pursued in tandem with further specific studies by SPIA of assessing environmental impacts from CGIAR research (see 3.4.1). Together these more detailed evaluations will augment the implementation of balanced approaches to NRM research in the current and future development of the SRF. [100,000]

3.1.3. Prospective study (identified under 3.1.1) for the updating of the next iteration of the SRF

The first of the foresight studies identified under activity 3.1.1 above will be designed in 2010 and conducted in 2011. Subjects that may be considered could include, for instance, the longer term effects of focusing research on poverty alleviation; bioenergy; defining research on emerging diseases in the light of climate change; or identifying approaches to minor crops research within a larger portfolio. These are all issues that are fundamental to improving the resilience of small farmer systems impacted by climate changes. These issues are raised implicitly but not explored explicitly in the SRF. [The study is nominally costed at 100,000 with 30,000 expected to be spent in 2010.]

3.1.4. Publication of IP Stewardship and Liability study and workshop outcomes.

Two expert reports on stewardship and liability in relation to third party intellectual property were commissioned by the SC and the drafts were the subject of a workshop with the Centers, CAS-IP, the CGIAR Secretariat and the Private Sector Committee in late 2009. The papers and recommendations arising from the Workshop will be published in 2010 to inform the development of IP policy and practice by the Consortium. [Continuing activity]

3.2 Mobilizing Science and Strategic Partnerships

The ISPC will facilitate a continuing dialogue with the main suppliers of international agricultural research as part of a process of continuously assessing the position of the CGIAR in a new and changing landscape of agricultural knowledge and innovation systems.

The ISPC will seek to mobilize international linkages and promote strategic partnerships in the CGIAR, partly through the existing involvement of ISPC members in those fora that bring the major research providers together. It will also convene meetings and undertake studies, underpinned by broad consultations and analyses that will lead to recommendations of the best way that the CGIAR can exploit emerging opportunities. It will disseminate information and highlight choices and options to the Consortium, and make recommendations to the Fund Council.

3.2.1. Outputs of Science Forum 2009

Science Forum 2009 brought together more than 300 participants from 55 countries, from advanced research centers, NARS, NGOs and from every CGIAR Center and Challenge Program, to examine recent scientific advances in six domains, and to explore new modalities for research collaboration. In order to disseminate its findings more widely, and to engage new interest in science for development among different parts of the global scientific community, the SC has negotiated with the American Society of Agronomy to publish a special edition of *Crop Science*, based on a selection of scientific papers presented at Science Forum 2009 and incorporating the conclusions of the Science Forum. This will be published in early 2010 so that the outputs of the Science Forum can serve as a scientific input to the GCARD process, and will be available for consideration in the current process to design mega-programs. The special edition will be free to access online. [17,000]

3.2.2. Innovative Organizational Arrangements of CGIAR Science for Impact.

Noting the changing landscape of agricultural research for development, the iISPC will undertake a series of consultations with stakeholders to explore the most effective modes of organizing science in programs involving CGIAR Centers and their partners. These consultations will help develop a foundation on which to build a network of contact points with other significant providers of international

agricultural research, CGIAR Centers, and other partners. The network will serve as a medium for the ISPC's work to mobilize science and enhance partnerships for greater development impact. To capitalize on existing opportunities for consultation, the iISPC will hold formal and informal meetings with stakeholders during the year including at the forthcoming GCARD 2010. [The meeting will take advantage of an existing CGIAR landmark and 10,000 is for the support of a small number of additional participants]

3.2.3. Stripe Review of Scientific Networks and Consortia.

The ISPC's role in enhancing CGIAR partnerships will be in the mobilization of opportunities for new science partnerships and in identifying and fostering organizational arrangements for the conduct of programs appropriate to CGIAR's goals. The iISPC will initiate a Stripe Review of Scientific Networks and Consortia, which would begin by (i) undertaking a desk study of current model initiatives in national and international science that illustrate innovative partnerships and collaborative arrangements, and, (ii) a more in-depth stripe review conducted with experts external to the CGIAR that would seek to explore effective modes of organizing science and the effectiveness of existing (partnership) arrangements in the CGIAR. In particular, this will examine more closely whether innovative international practice, or the Challenge Program or other collaborative modalities used by the CGIAR, provide appropriate organizing principles around which future CGIAR programs can be based. The stripe review would begin in mid 2010 and aim to present a preliminary report to Science Forum 2011. [The initial step is a desk study by secretariat; no additional costs associated with this part of the activity in 2010: Part (ii) is budgeted at 100,000, with 50,000 required in 2010].

3.2.4 Workshops on scientific and technical challenges

The ISPC will undertake to plan and organize workshops on specific scientific and technical challenges that pose particularly intractable problems for developing country agriculture. The ISPC will seek to organize these jointly with scientific organizations such as AAAS and ASA, with a view to improving opportunities for links between the CGIAR and these organizations, as well others such as AGRA and BMGF, and primarily with a view to engaging the scientific resources of the ARIs to address challenges facing developing country agriculture. In choosing workshop topics, the ISPC will seek to identify i) those that cut across the interest of several of the mega programs ii) those that have a strong potential for spill-over benefits across several regions iii) fields in which there are recent scientific developments that have a strong potential for development impact and iv) areas in which the CGIAR must build more effective partnerships if it is to accelerate progress in achieving its goals. The first workshop will be designed to feed its outputs into Science Forum 2011. [\$30,000 to hold a workshop in late 2010. The intention is to seek co-sponsorship for this and possibly similar events in the biennium].

3.2.5. Science Forum 2011

The ISPC will begin preparative work for Science Forum 2011 (SF11) in mid-2010. It is anticipated that SF11 will focus on a narrower set of research for development topics than SF09, and that issues of the changing agricultural research landscape will be given particular attention (the specific topics will be developed in consultation with stakeholders in 2010 – such as through the workshop identified in 3.2.4). The Meeting will foster the appropriate inclusion of new partner providers and the provisional findings of the Stripe Review of Scientific Networks and Consortia (3.2.3) will be reported. The findings of the ISPC study on integrative natural resources management research and impact scale (3.1.2) will also be presented. It is anticipated that, similar to SF09, the ISPC will secure a co-sponsor(s) to share the costs. [150,000, with starting costs in 2010 of 20,000]

3.2.6. Scientific mobility and partnerships in the CGIAR

On the basis of the SC's earlier studies and assessments, and adopting a more inclusive approach to capturing the best of world science for the goals of the CGIAR, the ISPC suggests that current and future incentive structures for promoting scientific linkages should be examined. The ISPC will therefore undertake a review of the mobility of scientists in the CGIAR. The review will gather information on current arrangements, incentives to attract and retain scientific talent, mechanisms to support the career progression of scientists within the System, and on the mobility of scientists between partners and other institutions. It will seek to make recommendations that will encourage strategic partnerships so as to enhance the quality and range of scientific skills available to the CGIAR. [33,000]

3.3 Independent program review

In 2010 the iISPC has three roles to play in review and evaluation. Firstly, there are continuing CGIAR requirements: to evaluate the SSA-CP to bring it into line with other CPs in the system and inform subsequent next steps, and to review CGIAR's Performance Management System (PMS) and scientific performance indicators in the transition year. Secondly, is the important role of developing the criteria and means to assess MegaPrograms. Thirdly is to provide the accumulated experience of the SC/iISPC to groups developing new performance and other monitoring systems in the new CGIAR.

3.3.1. Commissioning and organizing external review of SSA-CP

The SSA-CP is completing its three-year implementation phase that was scheduled for 2007-2009. Due to some delays the work related to this phase will be completed in 2010. ExCo endorsed the 2006 external review recommendations, one of which was that the SC commission another review at the end of the implementation phase to assess the results of the SSA-CP in three areas: 1) to provide a proof of concept for the

IAR4D approach to research organization in Africa; 2) to develop methods for conducting IAR4D; and 3) to establish innovation platforms and compile lessons from them. The SC proposes that the iSPC commission and organize on behalf of the CGIAR an independent external review in mid-2010 with the aim of evaluating the SSA-CP for its results in the social organization of research. The report will provide advice to the CGIAR on the future of the program considering both the results and experiences of the implementation and the changes in the CGIAR; how the progress and results should be utilized by regional organizations and stakeholders and by the CGIAR; and what experiences there are for organizing research in the new Mega-programs. [CGIAR planned activity – the review costs would be covered by the CP]

3.3.2. Design the ex ante assessment criteria and process for review of Mega-programs

The ISPC will contribute feedback to the Fund Council on the science quality of proposed MegaPrograms, the quality, rigor and validity of the underlying analysis/assumptions on which priorities and activities are proposed, and the potential for proposed activities to contribute towards CGIAR goals. The Mega-Programs will be large multi-component and multi-partner R for D programs. Their size will be comparable to or bigger than some Centers with currently the largest budgets (50-300 million US\$). MPs are likely to contain major long-term research components with short and medium-term research goals and delivery targets, and short-term focus on outcomes with defined partners. One Mega-program may also contain components of different kinds of research (ranging from high risk exploratory research to some adaptive regionally or locally targeted research) and different areas of research (for example genomics research or commodity oriented research addressed through multidisciplinary or participatory research); they will also contain appropriate capacity strengthening and uptake activities. Selection and assessment of such Mega-program proposals therefore differs considerably from assessment of previous CGIAR programs (although there are elements of similarity with the selection of Challenge Programs that can be helpful in the process).

The iSPC will organize a workshop to discuss and design a framework and criteria for assessing Mega-Program proposals. As the MPs are likely to differ from each other by size and other characteristics, their assessment may require a standard set of criteria that apply to all program proposals and additional criteria that take into account each MP's particular characteristics. The review criteria will to some extent reflect the criteria that will need to be used for monitoring and evaluation of the MP's. The workshop will therefore, in addition to providing the assessment criteria, yield ideas that can be used for defining performance and success indicators for the MPs.

The framework and criteria will be made available by mid 2010 in order to guide the development of the new Mega Programs.

The workshop will bring together (i) experts who have prior experience on selection and assessment of large multi-partner research programs, such as programs implemented within the EU Frameworks and BMGF's research programs; (ii) CGIAR senior researchers/ research managers that are in leading roles in designing Mega-programs; (iii) research managers in developing regions and advanced research institutions that have leading roles in implementing and participating in equivalent research programs; (iv) evaluators that have experience in assessment of equivalent programs. Background materials for the workshop will include, for example, relevant extracts from EPMR and CP review reports and previous CP assessments. [New activity of the iISPC; 50,000]

3.3.3 Ex ante reviews of MegaPrograms (2010-2011)

The iISPC will coordinate the ex ante assessment of Mega-Program proposals in 2010-2011 engaging external experts. The size and diversity of the selection panels will depend on the characteristics of each Mega-Program. [External consultant costs 100,000 US\$ spread over 2010 (20,000) and 2011 (80,000) and depending upon number of MPs selected for review and the size of the selection panels.]

3.3.4 Contributions to the Performance Measurement System (in 2010)

While the transition to Mega-program oriented research implementation is going on the CGIAR's Performance Measurement System will continue in 2010 (reporting 2009 data) with the current indicators. The iISPC's contribution includes calculation at the Secretariat of the publications indicator and assessment by the iISPC of the outcome indicator results. [Consultant fees, 12,000] [The impact indicator will also be assessed by the iISPC in 2010 - see activity 3.4.7.]

3.3.5. Follow-up to Stripe Review on Social Science in the CGIAR

iISPC will facilitate organization of a small follow-up workshop that will bring together interested donors, senior research managers from Centers and social science partners (NARS and ARI) to discuss the content and role of social sciences in the new CGIAR and plan action for improving the capacity, quality and focus of CGIAR social sciences as part of the design and implementation of the new Mega-programs. [New activity, 10,000]

3.4 Independent Impact Assessment

The Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) has reflected on SPIA's traditional business model of collaboration with Centers, i.e., providing intellectual guidance and financial support to selected Center *ex-post* impact assessment (IA) case studies focused on a particular impact or research-related area. In light of concerns about the quality of some SPIA-coordinated Center IA case studies and the limited capacity within Centers to successfully undertake these studies, SPIA questions whether the partnership mode of operation is still the best approach (founded on the earlier and

successful crop germplasm improvement IA study). This concern was reinforced by a key finding of the Social Science Stripe Review which highlighted the weak capacity in the Centers for conducting IAs, as reflected in many studies of low quality and credibility. The same report, however, sees an important continuing role for SPIA and recognizes that the Panel is significantly under-resourced to undertake a comprehensive agenda.

A new *modus operandi* for SPIA would transform it into a more independent body, commissioning (or undertaking itself) the primary *ex post* IAs on behalf of the donors. SPIA would still use, but rely much less on, Centers' own IAs. Centers, however, would still be critical in providing and facilitating the collection of the relevant data and information for these externally commissioned independent IAs. Beginning in 2011, therefore, with the commissioning of the poverty and food security impact indicators studies and the biodiversity study (see below), SPIA expects to adopt this new mode of operation, overseeing the conduct of independent IAs of CGIAR research. This has significant budget implications for 2011 and beyond.

Thematically, SPIA intends to focus its work over the next three years around filling critical gaps in IA, including work that will improve methods for undertaking studies on the impact of research on poverty reduction, food security, gender equality, and environmental sustainability. It will push out the knowledge frontier of IA into 'difficult areas' that have not been subject to IA, e.g., genetic resources and training. Finally, a challenge for the CGIAR is to maintain its flagship areas of IA, especially on germplasm improvement, updating previous information and measuring impacts that are of major interest to donors.

3.4.1. Deepening impact assessments of CGIAR research – measuring environmental impacts.

The CGIAR has done relatively little to document environmental impacts resulting from its R&D initiatives that affect the soil, water, wildlife and biodiversity of the local, downstream and global landscapes and environments. Efforts to document these 'externalities' have been impeded by difficulties of attribution of the impacts to research, lack of appropriate indicators for tracking environmental impacts, and valuation issues for costs and benefits not priced in the market. To build up an inventory of credible environmental impact assessments (EIA), SPIA commissioned and is currently providing external technical guidance and support to six CGIAR-research related EIA case studies (CIAT, CIP, ICARDA, ICAR, ICRAF and IWMI). The case studies provide an opportunity to develop, in collaboration with Centers, appropriate methods for measuring and valuing impacts on the environment attributable to CGIAR research. The case studies are expected to be completed in April 2010, and a synthesis and results workshop is planned for mid-2010. The six case studies will not offer a definitive statement about the aggregate impact CGIAR

research has had on the environment. On the other hand, these studies will add to the few empirical CGIAR and non-CGIAR EIA studies that do exist, and may provide useful insights about where and when CGIAR research is likely to have positive (or negative) impacts on the environment, and magnitudes thereof. Thus, the current case study exercise will be followed by a final phase encompassing (i) a comprehensive review of EIA of agricultural research, drawing on the results of these six and other empirical studies and the two background pieces commissioned earlier (Bennett, 2008; Goren et al., 2008), and (ii) the development of a conceptual framework for guiding future EIA work in the CGIAR where environmental impacts are a major focus of the Strategic Results Framework. [On-going study; Budget for 2010: 100,000]

3.4.2. Measuring social impacts.

Impact assessment in the CGIAR has moved well beyond the traditional rate of return studies. While donors still want to be re-assured that investing in the CGIAR pays handsomely, they are most interested in how the CGIAR contributes to global development goals, as defined in the MDGs. These are poverty reduction, food security, gender equality, and environmental sustainability. SPIA has long recognized the need to push impact assessment further down the impact pathway toward these goals. Previous work has attempted to document the impact of CGIAR research on poverty (IFPRI case studies) but has done little work on food security, gender and social impacts more generally. To deepen the assessments of impacts most closely related to CGIAR goals, three critical elements of 'social impact' will be investigated over the next few years, viz:

- a) Impact of CGIAR research on poverty reduction
- b) Impact of CGIAR research on food security
- c) Impact of CGIAR research on women (gender study)

Scoping studies will be commissioned in 2010 to (i) assess the extent of previous work documenting the cumulative evidence of impact of CGIAR research on poverty, food security, and gender (ii) identify methodological challenges and indicators of relevance; and (iii) consider undertaking case studies to develop methods and assemble more evidence of social impacts from CGIAR and NARS research. A phase 2, starting with case studies for documenting impacts on poverty (and thereafter food security and gender) would be undertaken in 2011 if deemed relevant. Work in this area potentially supports studies under 3.4.4. [Planned activity; Budget for 2010 (scoping study + poverty impacts case studies planning): 70,000]

3.4.3. Impact assessment of CGIAR research and research-related investments in collection, conservation, characterization and use of germplasm

There remain serious gaps in assessing impacts of particular, traditional activities within the CGIAR portfolio. One such area is ‘germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation’ (GCCCE), an area of investment that, while initially small, now represents some 10-13% of the total CGIAR budget. Yet, to-date, there are few assessments of its impact. The aim of this study would be to compile the documentable evidence of the impacts in terms of CGIAR goals from GCCCE related activities. In addition to quantifying in physical terms, the amount of germplasm collected, conserved, characterized and evaluated by CGIAR centers, the study would focus on estimating the value of the stored material using concepts like existence values, inter-generational equity and the like, as well as their contemporary value as sources of genetic material for breeding and biotechnology. [Planned activity; Budget in 2010 (scoping study): 22,000]

3.4.4. Crop germplasm improvement: updating databases and analyses of varietal adoption and assessment of economic, social and environmental impacts.

Despite the considerable amount of IAs of crop improvement research over the years that proved essential in documenting widespread impacts of the CGIAR’s investments, there is today relatively little effort being made to sustain and update that work. The Evenson and Gollen study (2003), the most comprehensive assessment to-date, used data from the Centers up to 1997, and some even earlier. If crop improvement research is considered the major success story, even today, it is essential to update that study. Basic data on adoption of improved varieties should be collected on a regular and systematic basis and made widely available. At last year’s SPIA-IAFP meeting, participants agreed that investing in surveys of varietal diffusion in several commodities, countries, and regions was necessary to supplement and validate national and sub-national expert opinion that was the basis for the earlier work. Subsequently, a 3-year \$3.0 million proposal on “Tracking Varietal Change and Assessing the Impact of Crop Genetic Improvement Research in Sub-Saharan Africa” was submitted by Bioversity to Gates on behalf of SPIA and the Centers. There are three major components to the project: widening understanding of genetic improvement; deepening understanding of varietal adoption; and gaining a comprehensive and deeper understanding of the impact of varietal change. The project was recently approved. Three SPIA members sit on the Project Steering Committee (PSC), along with two Bioversity staff members. No funds from the project grant are going to SPIA but an operational budget is required to support SPIA’s work on the PSC (travel & per diem). A separate study is currently being finalized that will cover crop improvement in South Asia to which SPIA may also contribute. [On-going study; Budget for 2010: 40,000]

3.4.5. Examining the potential of using randomized control trials for enhancing rigor and credibility in conducting large-scale ex-post impact assessment.

Phase 1 of this study – a literature review and conceptual analysis of the potential of using RCTs in epIAs – makes an explicit differentiation between the practice of ‘impact evaluation’ and ‘*ex post* impact assessment’ based on timing and motivations, and draws comparisons and implications for the scope and feasibility of using experimental designs along the results chain of R4D activities. This aspect is expected to be completed in late 2009 or early 2010. Phase 2 of this study will seek to compare in the field the potential value in using RCTs to more credibly estimate a key parameter in epIAs, the treatment effect, or ‘k’ factor. For two or three just released (and promising) CG-derived improved crop varieties, the effectiveness and efficiency of using (i) experimental, (ii) quasi-experimental and (iii) standard approaches for establishing the treatment effect (E_s) in large scale epIAs will be evaluated, e.g., for a maize improved variety, a sorghum improved variety, and a pigeonpea improved variety. The objective is to determine the cost effectiveness of using RCTs for assessing the value of some common CGIAR outputs. One or two case studies involving CGIAR centers will be undertaken and an expert in experimental methods hired to lead the study.

[Planned study; Overall Budget 105,000, including 75,000 to be committed in 2010]

3.4.6. Impact Assessment: Communication/Outreach

Two elements of communication of results of the impact assessment activities will be considered during the biennium: (i) SPIA - Center Impact Assessment Focal Point (IAFP) meeting: biennial meetings with general (sharing of information) and specific agendas related to impact assessment practices in the CGIAR [Budget for 2011: \$ 40,000]; and, (ii) Updates and a re-design of the CGIAR Impact webpage will need attention during 2010. This will be based on a systematic and comprehensive assessment of clients (donors) and their IA related needs. [Core Activity: Budget for 2010: 20,000].

3.4.7. Performance Measurement System – Impact Indicator, external peer reviews.

As in previous years, SPIA/SC has been asked to evaluate Center submissions with respect to the impact culture indicator for the PMS exercise in 2010. While SPIA members undertake much of the evaluation, they also rely on external peer reviews for some components of the analysis. [Core Activity: Budget for 2010: 8,000]

IV. BUDGET

The budget for the interim ISPC provides for three general functions: support for the iISPC Chair and Members to conduct the iISPC's formal meetings and provide representation to CGIAR and other fora, the cost of the iISPC's technical operations and the support costs of the full-time Secretariat.

In 2010, the interim ISPC will operate with a Chair and six Members (one less than that expected for the Science Council following the untimely death of Mike Gale whose position has not been filled). Additionally, there are three continuing Panel members who contribute to specific aspects of the Council's work (two associated specifically with SPIA, the other now appointed as Panel Member at Large), one less than in 2009. Ad hoc calls on SC Members' time have been increasing in recent years and these, and the need to keep abreast of international opportunities for mobilizing science under the new mandate, lead to a slight increase in projected iISPC running costs.

The iISPC Work plan for 2010 encompasses continuing, transitional and new activities (the latter in the process of development in light of the longer term execution of the ISPC mandate). However, the Work plan places emphasis on iISPC activities with an anticipated enlargement of impact assessment activities, science foresight and the mobilization of science. In 2010, these costs have been held down but it should be pointed out that new activities, and new ways of working, will require commensurate funding. For instance, for SPIA to conduct a wider suite of activities, and to conduct these with greater independence from the Centers, a higher activity budget should be anticipated for 2011. SPIA is also managing a study to update knowledge of the impacts of genetic enhancement research in the CGIAR, including impacts in Africa. A major external grant to Bioversity International on behalf of the collaborating Centers is supporting this study which is not reflected in the current SPIA budget - although the outcomes of the study will be analyzed and presented by SPIA as part of its work. In the past, many of the SC's studies required substantial calls on data and staff time from Centers. ISPC's activities in general (not only for SPIA) will need to be funded at levels commensurate with expectations. Conversely, the reduction in the traditional M&E activities conducted by the former Science Council are not immediately reflected in budgetary savings since the major costs (of EPMRs etc) were born by the Centers or Programs under review.

The SC Secretariat was understaffed in 2009 due to non-replacement of professional positions (Director and one P3 position). These are expected to be filled in 2010, but with other anticipated staff turnover, there is a reduction in Secretariat costs in the transitional year. Further development and precision of the ISPC activities and an expected adjustment of ISPC membership, particularly to encompass skills relevant

to the new ISPC mandate (such as, as an hypothetical example, in public-private science partnerships and organizational analysis) may be paralleled by corresponding adjustments in the ISPC Secretariat and will lead to the development of a new ISPC budget for 2011.

Table 1. Proposed budget for the interim ISPC for 2010 only

INTERIM INDEPENDENT SCIENCE AND PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL 2010 PROPOSED BUDGET (US\$000)				
Contributions	2008	2009	2010	2011
FAO	786	1,286	1,358	
WORLD BANK	786	786	786	
DONORS' FUNDING POOL	2,000	1,500	1,428	
<i>Total</i>	3,572	3,572	3,572	<i>tbd</i>
Expenditures				
COUNCIL				
Honoraria Chair and Office	311	317	317	
Honoraria (Council & Panel Members)	250	250	270	
Travel & Per Diem (Chair, Council & Panel Members)	225	225	225	
<i>Sub-Total SC Honoraria, Travel and Per Diem</i>	786	792	812	
[P& S Portfolio] Strategy and Trends	225	100	145	
[MS Portfolio] Mobilizing Linkages/Partnerships	70	200	160	
[SPME] Independent Program Review	115	100	92	
[SPIA] Standing Panel Impact Assessment	143	143	335	
<i>Sub-Total SC Technical Activities</i>	553	543	732	
<i>Sub-Total Council</i>	1,339	1,335	1,544	
SECRETARIAT				
Professional and Administrative Staff salaries	1,887	1,887	1,775	
Travel & Per Diem	121	120	100	
Consultants & Research Assistants	115	115	63	
Misc. Operating Expenses	110	115	90	
<i>Sub-Total Secretariat</i>	2,233	2,237	2,028	
TOTAL COUNCIL & SECRETARIAT	3,572	3,572	3,572	<i>tbd</i>
DIFFERENCE (CONTRIBUTIONS - EXPENDITURES)	0	0	0	0
Notes: 2008 and 2009 figures reported as per previous Work plan & budget [square brackets indicate the title of activities under the former structure]. FAO funding already declared [at USD 2,717 for the biennium 2010-2011] This table does not include external funds (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation). The form of funding support to the ISPC in 2011 requires discussion between the co-sponsors and the Fund Council.				

Table 2. Breakdown of Proposed Interim SC Technical Activities in 2010-2011

Areas of responsibility	Function/activity	Title	\$'000 2010	\$'000 2011 ¹
Foresight and strategy	meeting	3.1.1 Key trend analyses and presentation of ISPC outputs	15	
	core function	3.1.2 Achieving impacts at scale from NRM research	100	
	study	3.1.3 Prospective study contributing to SRF updating	30	
	study	3.1.4 Publication of IP Stewardship & Liability	0	
		Foresight and strategy Total	145	tbd
Mobilizing Linkages/ partnerships	meeting	3.2.1 Report on Science Forum 2009	17	
	meeting	3.2.2 Innovative organizational arrangements in science	10	
	study	3.2.3 Stripe Review of scientific networks and consortia	50	
	core function/ meeting	3.2.4 Workshop on scientific and technical challenges	30	
	core function/ meeting	3.2.5 Science Forum 2011	20	
	study	3.2.6 Human resource mobility in the CGIAR	33	
		Mobilizing Linkages/ partnerships Total	160	tbd
Independent Program Review	core function	3.3.1 External review of SSA-CP	0	
	core function	3.3.2 Design assessment criteria & process for review of Mega-programs	50	
	study	3.3.3 Ex Ante review of Mega-programs	20	
	core function	3.3.4 Contribution to Performance Measurement System	12	
	workshop	3.3.5 Follow up to Social Science Stripe Review	10	
		Independent Program Review Total	92	tbd
Impact assessment	study	3.4.1 Measuring Environmental Impacts	100	
	study	3.4.2 Measuring Social impacts	70	
	study	3.4.3 Genetic resources and biodiversity IA study	22	
	study	3.4.4 CGI impact update study – steering cmt meeting (once per year) & related tasks	40	
	study	3.4.5 Field testing RCT approaches	75	
	core function	3.4.6 Communication of IA results analysis	20	
	core function	3.4.7 Performance Measurement System – Impact Indicator, external peer reviews	8	
	meeting	IAFP-SPIA biennial meeting	0	
		Impact Assessment Total	335	tbd
		Sub-Total SC Technical activities	732	tbd

¹ Estimates based on projected activities (e.g. USD20,000 are convening costs towards Science Forum 2011 which might have a budget of 200,000 – to be met by ISPC and cosponsors in 2011).

ANNEX I

A SUMMARY OF PROGRESS MADE DURING 2008-2009 BY THE SCIENCE COUNCIL

1. Refining the Science Council's M&E Strategy

In the light of the CGIAR Change Process that began at the end of 2007, where it was foreseen that there would be changes to how research would be implemented in the CGIAR, the SC deferred from a major revision of the written strategy for M&E in the CGIAR. There were minor changes to the EPMR process (including better harmonization of data collection across reviews and more explicit guidance for EPMR teams to build on other M&E information). The SC also emphasized in the SPME meeting minutes and Council reports, for example, a) the importance for donors to receive and use the System's M&E information, rather than require their own parallel reporting and conduct parallel reviews; and b) to use various sources of M&E information (EPMRs, impact assessment and Performance Measurement information) to guide their funding decisions rather than base such decisions mechanistically on annual PM results only. In 2009 the SC synthesized its experiences in a document *Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and experiences*; and drawing from its experiences and perspectives a think piece for the benefit of M&E planning in the future: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the new CGIAR*.

2. The external reviews of the Generation CP, Bioversity International, ICRISAT and IRRI will be conducted during 2008-2009

The first external review of the Generation CP was completed in 2008, and the EPMRs of ICRISAT, IRRI, and Bioversity International in 2009.

3. Assessment of Medium-Term Plans

The SC prepared guidelines and carried out an assessment of Center and CP Medium-Term Plans in 2008 and 2009. In 2008 it initiated a process in which MTPs of sufficient clarity and quality were graduated to a schedule of periodic in-depth review (once in three-years) by the SC. Thus, in 2008, seven Centers' MTPs were endorsed without an in-depth review on the basis of the good quality MTP submitted the previous year. In 2009, an additional five MTP were included in this category.

This staggering of MTP reviews by the SC coincided with the development of a local application software for submitting MTPs (EasyMTP) and a Central database (CGMap) for storing the MTP data, both of which were operational for the first time in 2008. This has transformed the MTP into a set of data items stored in a searchable and analyzable database from which also a single document can be downloaded for review or information purposes. The SC was closely involved with the Centers and the ICT-KM in the design and development of the key characteristics of these new tools. The CGMap allows analysis of different aspects of the MTPs at a system level as it is likely to facilitate the transition from Center programs to mega-programs.

4. Review of CGIAR Social Science research

The first phase of the Social Science Stripe Review, which was a descriptive phase conducted as a desk study, was completed in 2008. The first phase yielded three products: 1. A background data report; 2. normative framework for conducting social science research in the CGIAR; and 3. the terms of reference for the main phase of the review. The main phase was conducted by the panel Chair, Chris Barrett, who also oversaw the 1st phase, and three other members representing diverse disciplinary backgrounds. The panel's report was completed in August 2009 and was considered at SC 12 in September 2009. A brief on the findings has been published.

5. Performance Monitoring of CGIAR impact indicator

SPME coordinated the SC's contribution to the PMS. This included preparation of the PMS instructions for both 2008 and 2009. The instructions and assessment criteria were revised particularly for the outcome indicator; a revised single indicator for publications was designed and discussion and development of a capacity building indicator was initiated. The SC's assessed the outcome indicator in 2008 and 2009. All the results on research-related indicators, and conclusions and analysis of them were communicated to the Centers in a feed-back document and individually in more detail. In 2008, SPME prepared an analytical paper suggesting revisions to the PMS, particularly regarding the results-based indicators, and it participated in organizing a joint workshop in Washington where SPME, SPIA and the SC Secretariat were represented. In 2009 the SC prepared a paper on experiences from five years of the PMS as one section of a joint document from the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat.

SPIA has worked closely with the Center Impact Assessment Focal Points (IAFPs) in joint meetings and kept the ADE group advised as various changes to the impact indicator, guided by principles of transparency and comprehensiveness, have been proposed and implemented. SPIA uses a combination of Center self-assessment, external peer review and its own judgment to evaluate Center submissions each year. It reports back collectively and individually each year to Centers to help improve performance.

6. Impact Assessment Focal Point (IAFP) Meeting

IAFPs from 13 Centers, two CPs and two SWEPS, two donor agencies, several IA/evaluation experts, SPIA and SC Secretariat staff and EMBRAPA scientists attended the biennial IAFP-SPIA meeting at EMBRAPA HQ 10-11 November 2008. As with previous SPIA-IAFP meetings, a significant amount of time was spent hearing from the Centers about their current IA related work and identifying challenges in IA. This was followed by sessions on donor expectations about IAs, proposed modifications for Impact Indicators in the PMS, clarifying purposes and exploring new approaches in epIA, discussing strategic issues in IA for the CGIAR, and presentations on: the use of randomized control trials for epIA, inter-center collaboration and unexplored IA areas. Key outcomes are described in "Defining and Refining Good Practice in epIA: A Synthesis Report", March 2009.

7. Publication of forthcoming SPIA documents

Several publications—final reports of SPIA-commissioned studies—were completed, printed and distributed, including:

Strategic Guidance for Conducting Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research

Impact Assessment of Policy-oriented Research in the CGIAR: Evidence and Insights from Case Studies and contribution of six case study reports to be published in the special issue of *World Development*

An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution

Short 4-6 page 'impact briefs' were published for each of the above full length reports

8. Environmental and social impacts of CGIAR Research

Phase one of this study was recently completed with the finalization of two consultancy reports after external peer review. One was a scoping study reviewing the state of arts in environmental and social impact (ESI) assessment and proposing an approach to quantifying environmental impacts through extended cost-benefit analysis (Bennett, 2009). The other focused on indicators and other measures of ESI that are considered separately with market costs and benefits using weighted indices and cost effectiveness (Djurfeldt, Fagerström and Fredholm, 2009). With novel approaches in hand, SPIA developed a proposal for moving forward with phase two – six Center case studies (IWMI, ICRAF,

CIAT, CIP, ICARDA, ICAR) have been selected. In June 2009, a planning and methodology workshop was held to finalize the workplans. The case studies are currently being implemented and a results workshop is planned in mid 2010.

9. Internal CGIAR demands for and uses of Impact Related Information

A 'synthesis' of the earlier desk study was prepared which summarized the findings of the exploratory study and attempted to respond to many of the major comments from the three external reviewers and SPIA members on the initial draft report. The demand for this study derives from an increasing emphasis given to learning for decision making and priority setting from all forms of evaluation, of which ePIA is one. SPIA maintains that learning should not come at the expense of de-emphasizing accountability. SPIA members agreed that given the lack of interest amongst center management for another set of interviews and questionnaires, it was best to defer initiation of the next phase of this study. Also, more clarity with respect to null hypotheses and appropriate method and means to test these is required before launching phase two.

10. Implementation of CGIAR System Priorities via Framework Plans

A green cover report "*System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015*", re-published in 2007, was the product of a three year Delphi-type process identifying science areas of relevance to the CGIAR and to the MDGs. One framework plan showing how an area could be implemented was developed and several others at a lesser level of detail. The approach was eventually taken over by research structured under "development challenges".

Although the strategy and results framework for the new CGIAR will replace the system priorities in due course, much of the definition of scope of activities and their descriptions, including the integration of priority areas for research, remain relevant for discussions of Mega-program development. The SC provided input into Working Group 1 of the Change process in identifying Key Research Opportunities for the CGIAR in 2008.

11. Ethics and the Mission of the CGIAR

The study was undertaken in response to a SC-commissioned review paper by Peter Sandoe, assisted by Karsten Klint Jensen, entitled "*How Should the CGIAR Handle Ethical Challenges?*" on the possible ethical issues affecting the CGIAR. The report identified four major areas of ethical concern to the CGIAR: research ethics, equity, protecting nature and respect for donors and partners. The study was completed in 2008 and compiled with two previous ethics studies (ethical challenges, ethics & CGIAR research) into a single report (Green cover). The Change Management Working Group 1 drew on some elements of the report.

12. IP Stewardship and Liability

The study is a follow-up to an earlier SC-GRPC work "*CGIAR Research Strategies for IPG in a Context of IPR: Report and Recommendations Based on Three Studies*" (Green cover, October 2006) and is addressing two main areas of consideration that GRPC saw as a prerequisite for the discussion on a possible new IP guidelines in the CGIAR. In close collaboration with CAS-IP, three consultants were hired to prepare the study, and the discussion draft was submitted to GRPC25 & SC11 in April 2009. A consultative workshop with SC, CAS-IP, ADE, and CG Sec with private sector representatives was held on 13 November 2009 (preceded by a ADE-PSC workshop on research management in public-private partnerships) to seek inputs for the further revision of the report in order to improve its practical utility, and to encourage a comprehensive approach to IP issues in general throughout the System. The studies will be finalized and published in early 2010.

13. Biosafety Workshop

A workshop *Biotechnology, Biosafety and the CGIAR* was convened in order to implement the final recommendation in the 2004 "Report of the Biosafety Panel to the CGIAR Science Council on Biosafety Policy Practices of the CGIAR Centers" (published May 2007). The workshop report was published in

February 2009 (White cover), where the participants recommended an establishment of a Biosafety Research Support Network. Follow-up work is required to consider how such a Network can be established and maintained.

14. Planning and Mobilizing Global Agricultural Science

The SC continued to consult with stakeholders in considering means by which science can be better mobilized to address the goals of the CGIAR. In light of consultations, the SC has further refined its draft Plan for Mobilizing Science, drafted at the request of ExCo-14 and endorsed by ExCo-15. The Science Council's role is that of a catalyst, facilitating linkages between the CGIAR and current and emerging stakeholders. With this plan, the Council is addressing the challenge of mobilizing science on three major fronts: (i) promoting linkages between the CGIAR and ARIs; (ii) promoting linkages between the CGIAR and institutions involved in product development and deployment; and (iii) increasing the visibility of the 'science for development' concept by organizing a biennial Science Forum. The draft plan will be further refined in line with the mandate of the new ISPC.

15. Joint CGIAR – Scientific Communities Meeting on Science for Development.

Science Forum 2009 was held on 16-17 June, in Wageningen, the Netherlands. It brought together more than 300 scientists from 55 countries, from advanced research centers, NARS, NGOs and from every CGIAR Centre to explore recent scientific advances in six domains and to identify areas where there is untapped potential to deliver an impact on development goals. The Forum also explored new modalities for research collaboration between the CGIAR and partners. The Science Forum was organized by the CGIAR Science Council in partnership with the CGIAR Secretariat, the Alliance of the CGIAR Centers, the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) and Wageningen University and Research Centre. The papers presented at Science Forum are being revised and compiled for publication in a special issue of *Crop Science*, due early 2010.

16. Final publication of the CGIAR Center-CSO Partnerships study.

A study of CGIAR-CSO partnerships: the study had been finalized with a summary published as Science Council Brief (Number 20, December 2007).

17. Biofuels Policy Statement

A SC position paper on biofuels was published that draws attention to critical issues surrounding biofuels, food security and the environment, highlighting the positive and negative consequences likely to emerge from different biofuels policies. A biofuels policy statement was proposed. The expansion of biofuels production worldwide has clear implications for CGIAR research, in particular for: (i) policy-related research—especially developing analytical frameworks and tools to assess the potential impacts of biofuels production on food security and environmental sustainability; and, (ii) sustainable intensification of traditional and new food crop and livestock systems; maintaining a tight focus on food security and environmental health goals consistent with the CGIAR mandate.

18. Systemwide initiatives

As follow-up to a meta-review of the Systemwide programs completed in 2007, the SC prepared an analysis with recommendations for defining an optimal role for systemwide initiatives in an evolving CGIAR: *The Role of Systemwide Initiatives in Implementing the CGIAR's Research Agenda; An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs* (2008).

19. Contributions to the CGIAR Change Process

Although not part of the original SC Work Plan the SC has contributed to four documents (3 published and one in progress) providing perspectives on the change, including Lessons Learned from M&E; Requirements for M&E in the new CGIAR; and Defining the role of a new ISPC. The SC is currently contributing with the CGIAR secretariat to a joint Lessons Learned document on the CGIAR's Performance Management System (PMS).

ANNEX II

UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SCIENCE COUNCIL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE 2008-2009 WORK PLAN

ACTIVITY	STATUS
1. Refining the Science Council's M&E Strategy	M&E related documents completed in 2009. Resulted in new guidelines and two papers on SC's experience with M&E (and draft on experiences with PMS) and a paper of needs for the new CGIAR
2. The external reviews of the Generation CP, Bioversity International, ICRISAT and IRRI	GCP review completed 2008; EPMRs of ICRISAT, IRRI and Bioversity completed in 2009.
3. Assessment of Medium-Term Plans	Assessment completed and SC MTP commentary submitted to ExCo in autumn 2008 and autumn 2009
4. Review of CGIAR Social Science research	1 st phase completed by September 2008 and 2 nd Phase completed by September 2009 Final Study Report considered at SC12
5. Performance Monitoring of CGIAR impact indicator	Indicator assessments completed by May in 2008 and in 2009, results shared with Centers and reported to ExCo. Experiences from five years of PMS written up in 2009
6. Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting	Completed; key outcomes and major discussion points summarized in "Defining and Refining Good Practice in Ex-Post Impact Assessment: A Synthesis Report", March 2009
7. Publication of SPIA documents	Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Guidance for Conducting Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research (final report) • Impact Assessment of Policy-oriented Research in the CGIAR: Evidence and Insights from Case Studies (final report) • An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution (final report) • Short 4-6 page 'impact briefs' were published for each of the above full length reports
8. Environmental and Social Impacts of CGIAR Research	Completed Phase I (two peer reviewed consultancy reports on environmental and social impact indicators); Phase II in progress with six Center case studies to document environmental impacts of CGIAR research.
9. Internal CGIAR demands for and uses of Impact Related Information	Completed. Phase I exploratory study (desk study report and final synthesis); Decision taken to defer implementation of Phase 2 until after CGIAR reform process / transition completed.
10. Implementation of CGIAR System Priorities via Framework Plans	Completed. <i>System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015</i> (green cover, republished in 2007). A summary on the process and concept behind the priority-setting exercise was submitted to the SRF group in 2009.
11. Ethics and the Mission of the CGIAR	Completed. <i>Ethical challenges for the CGIAR: Report of three Studies (2008, green cover)</i>
12. IP Stewardship and Liability	Ongoing. Discussion draft submitted to GRPC25 & SC11 (April 2009). Consultative workshop held with SC, CAS-IP, ADE, CG Sec, and the private sector on 13 November 2009 to seek inputs for revision, discuss IP issues in general, and to encourage a comprehensive approach to new IP guidelines in the CGIAR. Final report by February 2010.

13. Biosafety Workshop	Completed (with possible follow-up). Workshop report <i>Biotechnology, Biosafety and the CGIAR</i> published in February 2009 (White cover). Requires possible follow-up action in order to consider how a Biosafety Research Support Network can be established and maintained.
14. Planning and Mobilizing Global Agricultural Science	Consulted with stakeholders and refined the Draft Plan for Mobilizing Science
15. Joint CGIAR – Scientific Communities Meeting on Science for Development	Science Forum 2009, was held on 16-17 June, in Wageningen, the Netherlands. Immediate outcomes provided to the SRF team. Full Report by March 2010
16. Final publication of the CGIAR Center-CSO Partnerships study	Completed. Summary publication (Science Council Brief Number 20, December 2007).
17. SC policy statement on Biofuels	Completed. "Biofuels Research in the CGIAR: A Perspective from the Science Council" (May, 2008).
18. Systemwide initiatives	Published: The Role of Systemwide Initiatives in Implementing the CGIAR's Research Agenda; An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (2008).
19. Contributions to the CGIAR Change Process	Contributed: Key research opportunities for the CGIAR (SC, June 2008) - Science Council's contribution to the paper of WG 1 Defining the role of an Independent Science and Partnership Council (SC, April 2009). Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and Experiences (SC, April 2009) Monitoring and Evaluation in the new CGIAR (SC, May 2009) - A discussion document that looks at the likely needs for monitoring and evaluation processes in the new CGIAR Lessons learned from 5 years of the PMS: Research Performance Indicators (draft)

ANNEX III

INDEPENDENT SCIENCE AND PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(as described in the Summary Report of ExCo17, November 2009)

The Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) will be a standing panel of world-class scientific experts. The Council's overarching purpose is to provide independent advice and expertise to the funders of the CGIAR through services to the Fund Council and the Funders Forum. It will also serve as an intellectual bridge between the funders and the Consortium of CGIAR Centers.

The ISPC plays a vital role for the CGIAR to strengthen science, to improve productivity and quality of science, to catalyze the partnering of CGIAR science with other institutions of international agricultural research and to support the important role of the CGIAR as honest broker in various global debates.

In providing its advice, the ISPC will ensure alignment of programs with the Strategy and Results Framework. As part of a learning organization, the ISPC will capitalize on previous evaluations and seek to provide its learning to evaluations being done by the peer review process and eventual *ex-post* evaluation.

ISPC's specific tasks will be:

1. Commission and oversee evaluations of the scientific quality, relevance, partnership arrangements and likely development effectiveness of the investment proposals submitted by the Consortium to the Fund Council and make recommendations concerning their investment worthiness.
2. In undertaking the role described in 1 above, the ISPC will also provide feedback and guidance to the Consortium on any areas of concern regarding the quality of the proposed research and partnership arrangements contained in submitted investment proposals and on any deficiencies in the *ex ante* impact assessments provided by the Consortium in support of them.
3. Provide the Fund Council and the Funders Forum with foresight advice on trends and emerging issues, as well as potential strategies of addressing them related to the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework. In undertaking this role the ISPC will act as commissioner and coordinator of any required foresight studies, drawing on expertise within the Consortium and beyond, as appropriate, to undertake them.
4. To complement the GCARD process, in consultation and partnership with the Consortium and GFAR, convene periodic high-level scientific dialogues on high priority issues that will inform the scientific deliberations among CGIAR scientists and their research partners and help catalyze partnerships of the CGIAR with other global science communities.
5. Improve strategic investment decisions and help increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment studies within the CGIAR by commissioning, in partnership with the Consortium, *ex-post* impact assessment of the development effectiveness of CGIAR investments. The evaluation of the Mega Programs and system review will be undertaken by an independent evaluation arrangement, which will in turn avail itself of the lessons learnt from the ISPC's work.
6. Provide the Fund Council with independent advice on other matters upon request.