

# **CGIAR Fund Council**

**April 5-6, 2011**

**Montpellier, France**

## **Meeting Summary**



**CGIAR Fund Office**

**May 13, 2011**

## **Agenda Item 1. Opening Session**

The CGIAR Fund Council (FC) met in Montpellier, France on April 5 and 6, 2011. Fund Council Chair Inger Andersen opened the meeting. She welcomed new donor representatives attending the FC meeting (FC4) for the first time.

Phillip Chiverton (Sweden) was elected Co-chair of the meeting.

The provisional agenda was adopted.

The Chair informed the Council of her outreach visit along with the Chair of the Consortium Board (CB) to Belgium, European Commission, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and UK. High-level officials of these countries assured her and the CB Chair of their unequivocal support to the CGIAR, to maintain funding at present levels and strive to increase it. She was also made aware of concerns raised by the Centers with donors on the success of the reform, and she urged everyone to get on board, and contribute to the success of the new CGIAR.

In accordance with the FC Rules of Procedure, the Chair reminded the Fund Council members to declare any conflicts of interest regarding Fund Council business and agenda items.

## **Agenda Item 2. Fund Office Report and Follow-Up Actions**

Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary of the Fund Council (FC) and Head of the Fund Office (FO) presented a report on FO achievements since the last FC held in November 2010. The report included an update on CRP funding requirements and flow of funds in 2011.

He informed the FC that going forward the Fund Office will:

- maintain up to date information on shortfalls and imbalances in resources available for approved CRPs; and
- collaborate with the Trustee to enable it to carry out its responsibilities and meet and exceed Fund Donors' expectations

### ***Discussion:***

The World Bank announced that of its \$50 million contribution to the CGIAR Trust Fund, \$30 million is designated to Window 1 and \$20 million to the Provisional Account in order to enable the Bank to better respond to institutional and CRP needs as the reform evolves, and any small amounts that will be needed for Fund Office activities during the transition.

Gates informed that while their preferred option at the moment is Window 3, they are hopeful that in the future they will make use of the other Windows. Currently their support stands at \$50m with an additional \$19m targeted for the rest of the year, most of which will flow through Window 3.

On the question of whether there is sufficient funding for all CRPs awaiting approval, it was reiterated that based on funding estimates provided by donors and the projected timing of the cash flow, there are sufficient funds to cover the two CRPs approved in November 2010, (GRiSP and CCAFS), the five CRP proposals submitted for decision including the Genebank proposal, and the four additional CRP proposals that are being presented but are not for decision at the FC4 Meeting. The remaining five CRP proposals expected to be submitted next month by the Consortium have not been included in this forecast, as their budgets are not yet known.

**Conclusion:**

*Reforms are moving ahead and in line with the compact made at the start of the reform process, and efforts are underway to double the contributions to the CGIAR over time.*

**Agenda Item 3. Trustee Report on the CGIAR Fund**

Pamela Crivelli, Lead Financial Officer, World Bank, and Trustee representative presented the Trustee Report.

- There was positive movement in funds since distribution of the Trustee report. Italy, Turkey and UK had signed contribution agreements and Ireland was in the process of doing so. UK funds were being moved from the old Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) to the CGIAR Fund.
- The Trustee was working with the Consortium Office and the FO to determine the format of its reports that would best fulfill the FC needs and assist in its fiduciary responsibilities. A quarterly Financial Report, merging balances from the old MDTF will provide a clear picture of the available funds. An Oversight Report is under development.
- The Trustee was in process of providing funding information via the web to donors and recipients: a publicly accessible website for all Trust Funds administered by the World Bank, and a secure website providing detailed donor specific information. Both are expected to be functional in approximately 6 months. In the meantime, up to date financial information on CGIAR Fund is available on the Basecamp, accessible to Fund Donors.
- In continuing efforts to build efficiency gains and transparency, the Trustee is building a platform which will be available to the Fund Office and the Consortium Office. The “system” will support the FO to inform, plan and reduce duplication of efforts in monitoring pledges.
- The Trustee follows a conservative investment policy; hence significant investment income in the near future is not likely.

**Conclusions:**

- *The Trustee will provide an update on all of the above initiatives to the FC at its July meeting.*
- *Donors were requested to inform the FO about their indicative contributions as early as possible and expeditiously make contributions to Windows 1 and 2.*

**Agenda Item 4. Consortium Report**

Consortium Board (CB) Chair Carlos Perez del Castillo updated the Fund Council on Consortium activities focusing on developments since the November 2010 Fund Council Meeting. The highlighted items were:

- The revised Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) identifies the evolving context of international agricultural research and the role of the CGIAR within it. The document:
  - Defines the 4 strategic system level outcomes (SLOs).
  - Identifies thematic areas in which the CGIAR needs to have strong competencies in order to carry out the needed research in face of new challenges facing world agriculture.
  - Highlights the design of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) as the key instrument to achieve greater alignment of research outputs with the 4 identified SLOs.

- Emphasizes the key role of partnerships to reach concrete impact on the ground through an explicit impact pathway embedded in each CRP and addresses important governance management and institutional issues.
- The SRF and CRPs require to be viewed as living and evolving documents that will be adjusted to respond to new developments, opportunities and challenges.
- With the approval of the SRF, the CB and the proponents of CRPs will endeavor to adjust and align CRP components that are not in line with the SRF.CGIAR Research Programs (CRP)
  - All CRPs have been the subject of in-depth assessment by 4 external reviewers, one of which related to the Gender component.
  - Eight CRPs have been approved by the CB and sent for FC consideration.
  - CRPs are the operational arm of the SRF, hence designed as instruments to achieve greater alignment of research output with system-level outcomes. They exploit synergies across Centers.
- Scoping Studies
  - Two scoping studies on Gender and Genetic Resources cross-cutting issues completed.
  - CRPs will have a six month transitional period to adjust the Gender component to reflect the recommendations of the Scoping Study. All future CRPs will include Gender specific activities and will provide a separate section in the budget that addresses Gender issues.
  - The scoping study on Genetic Resources Cross-Cutting Issues is presently being analyzed in preparation for discussion at the May meeting of the Consortium Board.
  - The costing study commissioned by the CB and the Global Crop Diversity Trust (GCDDT) on genebanks is covered under Agenda Item 16.
- The Consortium Office has distributed draft documents on the Consortium IP Principles and a briefing paper entitled The Intersection of Public Goods, Intellectual Property Rights and Partnerships: Maximizing Impact for the Poor. Once approved by the Consortium Board and the Fund Council, the Principles document will form part of the Common Operational Framework (COF).
- The Agreement recognizing the International Organization (IO) status of the Consortium is in the final stages of drafting. It will require 2 signatories to validate its IO status. The Consortium Office has identified several countries whose signature does not require parliamentary approval. This will speed up the process of the Consortium becoming operational as an International Organization.
- The CB Chair requested for virtual approval of CRPs, to enable a staggered process that will resolve the existing backlog.
- The current estimate of the total CY 2011 stability funding from Window 1 is \$75 million, with \$46 million projected for the period January to June 2011. The second half of 2011 stability funding request will depend on the rate of implementation of CRPs, flow of unrestricted funding through Window 3 and/or bilateral donors as well as disbursements for the genebanks proposal.

### ***Discussion***

- FC members sought clarification on the process of establishment of the IO status. It was clarified that the IO is required for the Consortium to sign performance contracts. France has agreed to be the depository of the Agreement hence it will hold it during the time the

Agreement is open for signature by parties. This Agreement is in addition to and separate from the Headquarters agreement to establish the Consortium Office in Montpellier.

- FC emphasized that its measure of success will be the efficiency gains, clarity of roles at various levels of the CGIAR System and requested the Consortium to report back on efficiency gains achieved through the reform process.
- Concern was voiced on the funding for gender research in the CRPs. There seemed to be a gap in funding relative to the aspirations of the work to be done.
- On the question of the process and next steps in finalizing the IP Principles paper, the Consortium CEO confirmed that the deadline set by the Fund Office for submitting comments by April 29 was acceptable. The document is scheduled for discussion and approval at the May CB meeting. Subsequent to the Board approval, the IP Principles will be presented to the FC as the Consortium IP Principles. The FC will have an opportunity to review the paper and any significant comments will be taken into account prior to the Principles being incorporated in the Common Operational Framework.

#### **Conclusions:**

- *The driving force of the reform is simplification and efficiency of the System, and it is incumbent upon all to work towards a decrease in overall system costs. It is essential for the Centers to recognize and pursue this objective.*
- *As per the decision of the FC meeting in November 2010, all CRPs are expected to be aligned with the adopted Intellectual Property principles.*

#### **Agenda Item 5. CRP6 proposal: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry – livelihoods, landscapes and governance**

The CB Chair introduced the proposal as a clear and convincing strategic work program that fulfills the common criteria developed by the Consortium Board and the ISPC. He noted that the initiative is a timely response to global concerns as reflected in the UN designation of 2011 as the international year of forests.

Frances Seymour, Director General of CIFOR (the Lead Center) gave a presentation focusing on the rationale for having a CRP on forestry and agroforestry, the research framework and components of the program, cross-cutting approaches, sentinel landscapes, partnerships, communications and links between CRP6 and CRP7. She also elaborated on the management structure, the budget for the period 2011-2013 and risks and mitigation.

The ISPC Chair reminded the FC that his comments reflect the considered opinion of the ISPC, a Council of 6 members. The Council membership consists of Vibha Dawan, Margret Gill, Rashid Hassan, Marcio de Miranda Santos, Jeffrey Sayer and Derek Byerlee.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's commentary advising that all CRP proposals were reviewed by a common set of criteria agreed by the CB and ISPC.

The ISPC felt that the core issues of CRP 6 are compelling, of high potential and central to the CGIAR goals. It recommended approval of the proposal in principle with proponents asked to revise and address the following:

- depth of research on more innovative aspects (e.g. sentinel sites as unifying concept);
- prioritize research and focus on themes delivering IPGs (e.g. comp 1 & 2 better in CRPs 1.1 and 1.2);

- Ensure that links with all CRPs are effectively implemented (not only CRP7, but CRP5, CRP2, etc);
- re-consider management arrangement to ensure program coherence;
- Develop a budget with more realistic growth rates.

### ***Discussion:***

There were some queries raised for clarification and suggestions made to the proponents of CRP 6.

- CRP6 linkages with other CRPs, such as 7, 1.1, 1.2 and linkage between forestry, agriculture and climate change need to be enhanced. A set of robust decision rules to map out the role of each CRP and linkages with each other needs to be developed. The results of interaction among lead scientists of CRP6 and 7 is available in the Component 4 section of CRP6 proposal and Annex 3 of the proposal and provides specific examples of inter-linkages with other CRPs.
- Clarification was requested on the proposed governance structure of the CRP with a suggestion to have a management arrangement that ensures program coherence.
- Frances Seymour acknowledged the potential for conflict of interest in the present governance structure. However, based on the implications of the draft performance agreement, and experience at other Centers hosting independent Challenge Programs the CIFOR Board cannot accept accountability without the necessary authority to make decisions. The CRP builds in checks and balances to mitigate risks of the present governance structure. It was noted that this issue is not unique to CRP6.
- FC members queried the budget projection of the CRP over the three year period 2011-2013 and requested clarification on the “red band” or gap in funding. It was clarified that the “red band” is the residual after subtracting restricted funding in hand, and a modest annual increase in current levels of unrestricted funding, in accordance with budgeting guidance provided by the Consortium last year. Frances Seymour explained that for 2012 and 2013 additional funding will be required over the two years and requested guidance on the responsibility for raising those funds.
- The proponents submitted two scenarios: Business As Usual (BAU) at \$78.4m for Year 2 and \$86.7m in Year 3. The What It Takes (WIT) scenario requested \$107m in Year 2 and \$117m in Year 3.
- Frances Seymour further clarified that the CRP level budget requests for management, communications, gender and sentinel landscapes represents the additional incremental costs at the CRP level such as specialty advice, partnerships etc. and does not include costs that are internalized into research components.
- For 2011 the amount requested from the Fund will depend on funding received bilaterally and through Window 3 to participating centers, whether the requested stability funding will be provided in entirety and whether Centers are required to assume full liability for the “gap” which is the difference between the two amounts.
- On the question of the large number of partnerships, it was clarified that the extensive year long consultations with partners has raised expectations and part of the increase in funds in 2012 and 2013 is due to sharing more funding with partners.
- FC members congratulated CRP 6 proponents on the use of sentinel landscapes and felt it was a very important area of work.
- FC members, however, suggested that a CGIAR-wide coherent strategy on sentinel landscapes be considered and cautioned that sustaining the work in the long term with adequate funding would be a challenge.

## Proposed Total Budget of CRP6 Proposal: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance

(in \$ million)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Fund Council Allocated Component: Window 1 and Window 2	25.4	30.5	34.4	90.3
Window 3 and Bilateral Component	42.5	47.9	52.3	142.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	67.8	78.4	86.7	232.9

### Conclusions:

- FC expressed appreciation to Frances Seymour and all those involved in the formulation and development of the CRP6 proposal.
- Strong support for approval of the proposal was expressed by FC members. FC's decision on the CRP6 proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.

## Agenda item 6. CRP2 Proposal: Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Poor

The CB Chair introduced the proposal indicating that the justification of the three focus areas of policies, institutions and markets in CRP2 are convincing and the evidence on how the activities will achieve program goals is well presented. This CRP shows that social science and policy research can best be organized within the CGIAR system by being better aligned around system-level outcomes. It fulfills the common criteria developed and is a comprehensive and strategic work program to address the CGIAR vision.

Shenggen Fan, Director General of IFPRI (the Lead Center) presented the proposal. To address the challenges in promoting improvements in policies, institutions and markets that will help achieve CGIAR system level outcome of poverty reduction and food security, the CRP focuses on the following three themes: *policies and investments that accelerate pro-poor growth; enabling institutions and governance for the poor; and value chains linking smallholder farmers to markets.* Shenggen Fan also elaborated on rationale, strategic objectives, priorities, innovative research programs, capacity strengthening, partnerships, impact, and management aspects of the CRP.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's commentary advising that CRP 2 builds on a strong foundation of policy-related research within the CGIAR. It is a very wide-ranging and comprehensive proposal with much of the proposed work central to the CGIAR's core business. The ISPC recommends that CRP2 be resubmitted after substantial revisions, focusing in particular on:

- Identification and elaboration of key problems and opportunities for research on specific agricultural and rural development policies, investments, institutions and markets that offer greatest scope for measurable progress towards CGIAR goals.
- Further development of a strategic framework that encompasses clearer articulation of priorities and rationale for them – across and within sub-themes; an assessment of alternative research providers and CGIAR comparative advantage, and a clear focus on production of well-defined and high priority IPGs.

- Application of the strategic framework to develop a more focused and coherent research program around major constraints and opportunities;
- More specific elaboration of the key outcomes and impacts being targeted by sub-themes or activities, and the impact pathway narrative for those.
- Further elaboration of the specific roles and synergies of IFPRI and other CGIAR and non-CGIAR partners working together.

***Discussion:***

- On the question of distinction between IFPRI's ongoing work and CRP 6 proposed research, the presenter pointed out that every theme and sub-theme identifies the on-going work and proposed research. A two to three- year transition period is envisaged to wind down on-going research at IFPRI.
- On the query of wide-ranging list of activities that does not reflect priority setting, it was clarified that priorities for the CRP are demand driven, i.e. derived from challenges and opportunities facing policies, institutions and markets. Priorities were derived from the SRF taking into consideration the comparative advantage of the CGIAR Centers, and the new priorities were derived from the wide consultation with partners and policy experts. Linkages with this network in particular GFAR and GCARD roadmap should be maintained.
- On the observation that there is lack of focus on core competencies and comparative advantage of CRP2, it was pointed out that factors affecting global food security are very complex with non-traditional factors such as trade, finance and climate change affecting global food security more than technology policies. CRP 2 is uniquely placed to work on these issues, particularly since alternative suppliers are not looking at impact of these factors on food security on agriculture and rural development.
- On the rationale for undertaking foresight work, it was explained that priority setting for the broader agriculture and rural development agenda requires strong research support which can only be provided by a CGIAR Center. CRP2 plans to link with ISPC and GFAR to provide research support, analysis and facilitation in foresight activities.
- Concern was raised that policy research for the entire CGIAR is bundled into this one CRP. The CB Chair as well as the Director General of IFPRI assured the FC that all CRPs have policy components relevant to their CRP (i.e. natural resources management, crops, livestock, fish...). CRP2 focuses on cross-cutting synergies and multi-commodities, providing an enabling policy environment for developing countries to adopt technologies that other CRPs develop.
- In order to maintain an efficient management system, IFPRI, as the lead center, will use performance contracts to hold CGIAR Centers and external partners accountable for their outputs and deliverables.



**Proposed Total Budget of CRP2 Proposal: Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Poor**

(in \$ million)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Fund Council Allocated Component: Window 1 and Window 2	28.2	45.7	60.7	134.6
Window 3 and Bilateral Component	54.1	42.3	34.6	131.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	82.3	88.0	95.3	265.6

**Conclusion:**

- FC thanked Shenggen Fan and his co-proponents for the CRP2 proposal.
- FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.

**Agenda Item 7. Joint Agreement**

The Joint Agreement is the result of 10 months of intensive discussion among the Consortium, the Fund Donors, the Trustee and the Fund Office. There has been constructive engagement to reach convergence on all outstanding issues. Approval of the Joint Agreement will enable funds to be disbursed to lead Centers of approved CRPs from Windows 1 and 2.

**Discussion:**

- FC members acknowledged that the process of negotiation has been very beneficial in raising issues and allowing all stakeholders to recognize their interests.
- The opportunity cost of not moving forward is great.
- The Common Operational Framework. (COF) will include the M&E Framework and the Intellectual Property Principles which will encompass the IPG aspects of the CGIAR research activities. The COF is referenced in the Joint Agreement.

**Decision:**

*The FC approved the Joint Agreement and the forms of Consortium Performance Agreement and Payment Request, attached to it as Annexes 1 and 2, respectively. The FC also approved the amendments to the Glossary, Governance Framework and Contribution Agreement (and Contribution Arrangement, as marked in the Contribution Agreement) which have been made to conform to the Joint Agreement. The JA is available at <http://www.cgiarfund.org>*

**Agenda Item 8. CRP1.1 proposal: Integrated agricultural production systems for the poor and vulnerable in dry areas**

The CB Chair introduced the proposal indicating that the Consortium Board has advocated since its first meeting that research on production systems is at the core of the CGIAR reforms. CRP 1.1 provides an excellent foundation to develop an integrated agricultural production system for dry

areas and is one of the most innovative in the CGIAR reform. This CRP has been conceptually one of the most difficult to conceive and brings a new challenge for implementing it with multiple partners in the dryland areas.

Mahmoud Solh, Director General of ICARDA (the Lead Center) presented CRP1.1. To address the challenges in agricultural production systems in dry areas, the CRP will focus on four Strategic Research Themes (SRTs) which cut across five focus regions: Western Africa and the Sahelian Region, Eastern and South Africa, North Africa and West Asia, Central Asia and South Asia. These SRTs represent steps in the impact pathway. Partnerships in CRP1.1 will include all major players; research on gender-related issues and capacity development are key components in all CRP 1.1 research. CRP 1.1 is expected to evolve over time, streamlining the content in relation to the CRP mandate and vision, and expanding stakeholder commitment and investment in the shared vision.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's commentary stating that the CRP1.1 proposal is an example of the CGIAR transition at work. The core issues of the drylands and associated poor and vulnerable communities are compelling, and impacts from research would be central to the CGIAR goals as given in the SFT. The ISPC Chair stressed that this CRP is conceptually one of the most difficult to conceive and brings a new challenge to implement it.

The ISPC recommended that the CRP is not ready for approval. However, it encouraged the Fund Council to provide sufficient first year funding for further program development and re-submission of a revised proposal. That revision should provide:

- Clear characterization of target dryland systems.
- Establishment of hypotheses as an organizing principle to help prioritize the research and results agenda.
- Criteria for choice of benchmark sites and relevant data to inform research requirements in both the biophysical and social sciences, and their synthesis
- Refinement of site selection and characterization and prioritize activities to be carried out *working from impacts to activities*
- More detail on the underpinning science and agronomic, genetic, and farming system approaches to be evaluated once the first phase has progressed
- A more comprehensive theory of how social change will result from the livelihood, gender and innovations systems approaches espoused in the current proposal.

**Discussion:**

- FC members acknowledged that CRP 1.1 is a challenging research program
- The CRP proposal is strong on diagnosis but weak in identifying the research interventions proposed. Program appears to be an adaptive research cum development program, with little strategic research envisaged.
- While partners are mentioned extensively, only 15% of the budget is allocated to partners. Given the strong role that partners will play in disseminating the outputs of the research, they need to be involved in the project design and be properly funded.
- Without a logical framework it is difficult to get a clear picture of the four strategic research themes which seem to be result statements, objectives and outcomes.
- Brazilian semi-arid area is the most populous in the world; however no attempt has been made to partner with the Latin American region.
- Concern was expressed regarding the structure of the proposal with strategic research themes (SRT) 3 and 4 being of a different nature from SRT 1 and 2.

- A concern was raised that ISPC comments were not available to FC members two weeks prior to the FC meeting. It was further pointed out that there is a potential reputational risk for the donors and Consortium if the process leads to a perception that an important proposal is approved without a rigorous and credible evaluation process. The issue was resolved after the concerned FC members were given some time to meet with their constituencies who were present at the meeting.
- The difference in the roles of the crop/commodity and systems CRPs is not sufficiently articulated. There is no mention made about what this system CRP will not do.
- The strong links between politics and policies in dryland areas where transformational change is difficult to achieve need to be considerably strengthened.

**Conclusions:**

- *FC thanked Mahmoud Solh and his co-proponents for the CRP2 proposal.*
- *It was noted that this is the first proposal that works in an eco-system landscape.*
- *An added complexity for the FC in its decision-making process is the need to know what to expect from system CRPs relative to the crop/commodity CRPs.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

**Proposed Total Budget of CRP1.1 Proposal: Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable in Dry Areas**

(in \$ million)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Fund Council Allocated Component: Window 1 and Window 2	19.0	23.5	27.8	70.3
Window 3 and Bilateral Component	18.4	17.3	16.7	52.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	37.4	40.8	44.5	122.7

**Agenda Item 9. Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Program**

The SSA-CP agenda item was for discussion at the request of one FC member constituency.

The Consortium Board Chair reminded the FC that the CB policy has been to integrate all Challenge Programs (CPs) into CRPs. As the SSA-CP was under review by the then interim ISPC and did not participate in the integration process, the CB's recommendation, in conformity with the recommendation of the ISPC is that the program continue for 2 additional years funded by its traditional donors, while concurrent discussions to accelerate the integration of SSA-CP into CRPs continues. Components of the program can successfully be integrated into CRP 1.1, as well CRPs 2 and 5.

**Discussion:**

- FC members pointed out that SSA-CP was always considered a CGIAR program and should continue to be considered as such. The SSA-CP research has produced results that are of value to the CRPs and the CGIAR as a whole, and should not be lost.
- On the question of funding the SSA-CP in its transition period, the Executive Secretary reminded FC members that the FC could respond only to funding requests put forward by

the Consortium. At the conclusion of the 2-year transition period the Consortium could revisit this issue.

**Conclusion:**

- *SSA-CP is encouraged to engage further with the appropriate CRPs including CRP 1.1 to determine which components can be integrated into such programs.*
- *Simultaneous discussions should be undertaken by SSA-CP management with individual donors providing bilateral funding to explore potential support for SSA-CP's work program for 2011 and 2012.*

**Agenda Item 10. CRP3.2 proposal: MAIZE-Global Alliance for improving Food Security and the livelihoods of the Resource poor in the Developing World**

The CB Chair introduced the MAIZE proposal indicating that it aims to ensure publicly-funded international agricultural research will contribute to double the productivity of maize-based farming systems, making them resilient, sustainable and significantly increasing farmers' income and livelihoods. The CB considers this proposal is well structured and brings a sound strategic approach to maize research.

Marianne Banzinger, Deputy Director General of CIMMYT (the Lead Center) made the presentation on behalf of Thomas Lumpkin, who was unable to join the FC meeting due to the visit of President of Mexico to CIMMYT at that time.

To tackle the food security challenges related to this crop, the Global Alliance on Maize is implementing a new strategy for international maize research. The CRP arrived, in collaboration with a wide range of partners, at a nine point action plan, called "strategic initiatives". These initiatives will complement the intervention of individual countries, NARS and the private sector.

MAIZE involves many different and diverse partner groups. Hence a very decentralized approach is used to manage the partner relationships. Most of the decisions are taken at the regional and strategic level in a collaborative manner. The primary research partners are involved in the Management Committee and the Oversight Committee representing regions and R&D stakeholders groups.

The ISPC considered this CRP proposal to be well structured, articulated and conceptualized with two distinct target groups of maize producers. It identified areas geo-spatially and overlay data on poverty, malnourishment and agro-ecosystems and farming systems. Maize is one of the three global food security crops; among the three, it is the most dynamic in terms of demand growth, yield growth, and potential pressure on land-use change. Maize is also very important as a food crop and as an income source to many of the world's poor. Therefore, a CRP on maize and maize systems is justified with a compelling rationale and clear overall goals.

The ISPC recommends that the proposal be approved. The proponents are strongly advised to address the following issues when defining and implementing the operational plan and strategy:

- CRP3.2 should give more strategic consideration to (a) poor consumers as a distinct beneficiary group of maize research; and (b) the dynamics in demand and use of maize (food, feed, fuel) and the dynamics in research supply (private sector) expected in target areas 1 and 2

- CRP3.2 should develop a coherent program-level product delivery strategy that better aligns the SIs with program-level outcomes, considering also capacity and support for delivery and stakeholder feed-back.

### ***Discussion:***

- On the question of incentivizing partnerships, it was pointed out that the CRP's intention is to make maize research 100% demand- driven based on private sector advice for work to be carried out in the public sector.
- A question was raised on transgenic research, in particular the share of resources applied to transgenic research and the area where this research is used. Transgenic research is 100% bilaterally funded and at this stage less than 5% of the investment flows to it and only in relation to S14. Moreover, the research is carried out only in countries that request it and have bio-safety regulations in place. The CRP contributes objective information on what is possible, the risks and dangers and the opportunities provided by this research.
- On the question of the CRP's strategy to manage its large number of partners, it was noted that their partners were easily categorized into the 9 strategic initiatives, allowing further prioritization of research activities based on feedback received from programs, institutions and regions. This information is used for fund allocation.
- There is a fine line on participatory decision making. Many mechanisms exist within the CRP to get wide-spread partner input. The CRP follows the guidance of Steering Committees on making decisions on support and priority setting.
- FC members requested CRP3.2 to serve as a model on IP management issues and share lessons learnt with other CRPs. CIMMYT has developed an IP Manual and are willing to share it within the System.
- On the question on the Director position of the CRP, it was clarified that the CRP is considering a CEO type Manager of the program as there is sufficient leadership with scientific background
- ISPC noted that this CRP will be a good test of interaction between commodity- based and systems based CRPs. Movement of technologies developed by the Maize program to the system based CRPs will be a good indicator of success.
- The work on different crops will be interlinked through the 3 system level crops on drylands, humid areas and aquatic and coastal systems. The CB acknowledges its responsibility to ensure that there is overall scientific coherence among all crop research, identify gaps and overlaps and encourage synergies.
- On the question regarding proportionate contribution to System costs from different types of funding, the Executive Secretary explained that the Joint Agreement, recently approved, laid out two very important principles: one on fully costed research proposals and the second on System costs for operating the FC, FO, Consortium, ISPC etc. which is borne by all funds going through the System. The only exception to non-contribution of Systems costs is bilateral funding streams that were in existence at the start of a given CRP. Any new bilateral funding will contribute to Systems costs, as will any additional funding streams coming into existing contracts and agreements.

### ***Conclusion:***

- *FC thanked Marianne Banzinger and her co-proponents for the CRP 3.2 proposal.*
- *It was noted that workshops on some of the broader issues could be helpful. The following were mentioned.*
  - *Price volatility and agriculture productivity*
  - *Maize and bio-fuel*

- FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.

**Proposed Total Budget of CRP3.2 Proposal: MAIZE – Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and Livelihoods of Resource-poor**

(in \$ million)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Fund Council Allocated Component: Window 1 and Window 2	14.2	14.9	15.6	44.7
Window 3 and Bilateral Component	39.8	41.8	43.9	125.4
Expanded Funding Component				67.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	54.0*	56.7*	59.5*	238.0**

\* does not include Expanded Funding Component

\*\* includes Expanded Funding Component over three years

**Agenda Item 11. Decision Session on agenda items 5, 6, 8 and 10, and next steps regarding other CRP proposals submitted by the Consortium**

In discussing CRPs, it became evident that uniform criteria to rate the CRP proposals and provide clear guidance to the proponents were required. Hence the following four categories of decisions were suggested for use by the FC in its decision making process.

**CATEGORY I: Approval**

- Light adjustments which the Fund Council expects proponents to take into consideration

**CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions**

- 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Virtual 'no-objection' approval of the proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision will be taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

**CATEGORY III: Request re-submission of the CRP proposal**

- Substantial 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

**CATEGORY IV: Rejection**

**Discussion:**

- FC Members appreciated receiving a suggested decision frame to guide their deliberations; they welcomed the use of the 4 categories of FC decisions on the CRP proposals.
- Unless fundamental changes are required to the proposal, categories II and III will undergo an internal review by the ISPC.

- A Category III rating signifies that the proposal requires substantial revisions and resubmission to a face-to-face FC meeting. A re-submitted proposal will be re-evaluated and will not receive an automatic approval.
- The Consortium Board Chair noted that when submitting proposals, the CB is guided by the SRF, and submits proposals that conform to criteria that are agreed with the ISPC.

#### **Decisions:**

- The four categories of FC decisions on CRP proposals were adopted.
- **CRP6: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry – livelihoods, landscapes and governance** –The overall proposal and total budget was Approved with light adjustments (Category I).
- **CRP 3.2:MAIZE:Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource poor in the Developing World** –The overall proposal and total budget was Approved with light adjustments (Category I)
- **CRP 1.1 Integrated agricultural production systems for the poor and vulnerable in dry areas** – The overall proposal and total budget was Approved with Conditions (Category II)
  - The Fund Council requested the proponents of the CRP1.1 to take necessary time to revise the proposal; a speedy turn-around is not the objective. ISPC will then make commentary on the revised proposal.
  - Following which the revised proposal will be submitted to the Fund Council for virtual approval on a 'no objection' basis. If there is any objection by a Fund Council Member, then the proposal will be discussed at the following Fund Council Meeting.
  - **Must Haves:**  
*Please see Annex 1*
- **CRP2: Policies, Institutions, Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Poor** – The decision was Request re-submission of the CRP proposal (Category III)
  - **Must Haves :**  
*Please see Annex 2*

#### **General Comments on Harmonization and Requirements for Submission of CRP Proposals**

It was agreed that a common format for CRP proposals will be developed collaboratively by the Fund Office and the Consortium Office. The template will include:

- Common cover page
- Common budget format
- Common Headers
- Executive Summary
- Annexes that are standard to CRPs
- Maximum page length
- Disbursement profiles

The FC Chair will adhere strictly to the Rules of Procedure with respect to timeliness. Documents related to agenda items not received by the Fund Office, at least 2 days prior to the 2 week deadline for distribution to the FC will not be sent to FC and the agenda item will be dropped.

***The following four agenda items were chaired by Phillip Chiverton (Sweden), Co-Chair of FC 4 Meeting***

**Agenda item 12. CRP 3.7 proposal: More meat, milk and fish by and for the poor**

The Consortium Board Chair expressed the view that Center staff must have adequate time to present their proposals and receive feedback from Fund members. In order that the proponents have the maximum time available to them, the CB Chair refrained from making introductory remarks.

Carlos Sere, the Director General of ILRI (the Lead Center for CRP 3.7) gave a presentation with the following highlights:

- The overarching goal is to increase productivity of small scale livestock and fish systems so as to increase availability and affordability of meat, milk and fish for poor consumers, and a greater participation along animal source food value chains.
- The focus is on value chains for which there is a high potential for transformational improvement.
- The program is centered on three Research Themes. 1) Technology Development; 2) Value Chain Development and 3) Targeting, Gender and Impact.
- Cross-cutting platforms are M&E, Communication and Capacity Building
- An organizational and implementation strategy and framework will be established to ensure the smooth functioning of the Program and its partnerships.

***Conclusion:***

*FC members thanked Carlos Sere for his presentation and informed him that they were looking forward to discussing this CRP proposal at the next FC meeting.*

**Agenda Item 13. CRP5 proposal: Water, land and ecosystems**

Colin Chartres, the Director General of IWMI (the Lead Center for CRP5) gave a presentation with the following highlights:

- Water, Land and Ecosystems CRP focuses on three critical issues: water scarcity, land degradation and ecosystem services.
- CRP5 is different because of the following reasons: it responds to a changing set of drivers outside of water or land sector; ecosystem services are difficult to value; it is non-market economy; has cross scale interactions; issues of ownership of land and water are complex and institutional arrangements are rarely conducive to NRM.
- The core of the CRP5 research program is a set of eight problem sets, relevant in regions where there are high levels of poverty and degradation.
- Has multiple paths to impact with focus on clients, regional integration focal countries, partnership networks and capacity building.
- Cross-cutting areas are Gender, Governance and Poverty.
- Has a simple, cost effective management mechanism that relies on the existing capacities of participating centers and institutes.

***Conclusion:***

*FC members thanked Colin Chartres for his presentation and were looking forward to discussing this CRP proposal at the next FC meeting.*



#### **Agenda Item 14. CRP3.1 proposal: WHEAT - Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource poor in the Developing World**

Marianne Banzinger, Deputy Director General of CIMMYT (the Lead Center) made the presentation on behalf of Thomas Lumpkin.

She highlighted the following:

- Demand for wheat in the developing world is projected to increase 60% by 2050, at the same time climate change induced temperature increases are likely to reduce wheat production in developing countries. Prices will more than double, eroding the purchasing power of poor consumers.
- CRP3.1 Grand Challenge is to dramatically boost farm-level wheat productivity, while renewing and fortifying the crop's resistance to globally important diseases and pests, enhancing its adaptation to warmer climates, and reducing its water, fertilizer, labor and fuel requirements.
- WHEAT will pursue a Ten- point "Strategic Initiatives" action agenda.
- The Management structure is very decentralized consisting a Program Management Committee which includes primary research partners and an Oversight Committee representing regions and R&D stakeholders.

#### **Conclusion:**

- *FC members thanked Marianne Banzinger for the presentation and were looking forward to discussing this CRP proposal at the next FC meeting.*

#### **Agenda Item 15: CRP1.3 proposal: Harnessing the development potential of aquatic agricultural systems for the poor and vulnerable**

Steve Hall, Director General of WorldFish (the Lead Center) made the presentation of CRP1.3. He highlighted the following:

- Three messages were highlighted – this CRP is different, this is what the CG reform is all about and it is hard, but can bring real change.
- This CRP is not about fish.
- The CRP is trying to bring together several threads of contemporary development thinking in a new way.
- Demand driven multi-dimensional perspective will tailor solutions to specific needs of different households living in different environmental and socio-cultural conditions.
- Participatory gender approach lies at the core of the program.
- Identify gender-equitable options to improve the lives of smallholder households, embracing old and new technologies that combine farming, fishing, aquaculture, livestock rearing and forestry with processing and trading of agricultural commodities and non-agricultural livelihoods.
- International Public Goods – learning on how to bring technologies together to bring about development better and faster.
- Commitments to place that the CRP1s offer, where water productivity will have a huge impact on agriculture.
- Potential to scale out
- Risks include insufficient front-loaded funding to glue to all together

**Conclusion:**

- *FC members thanked Steve Hall for the presentation and were looking forward to discussing this CRP proposal at the next FC meeting.*

**Agenda Item 16. CRP Proposal on Genebank**

Lloyd le Page, CEO of the Consortium presented the CRP proposal on Genebank. A study was commissioned by the Consortium Board in 2010 to protect this unique asset and ensuring their widespread diffusion, use and access for the public at large. The study identified the permanent or in perpetuity cost of maintaining the plant germplasm collections that are held *ex situ* by the Centers.

The funding proposal was prepared in 2011 in collaboration with the Global Crop Diversity Trust, the CGIAR Centers and experts commissioned by the Consortium Board. The proposal recommended funding for the genebanks based on the findings of the genetic resources scoping study.

The ISPC Chair recommended that the proposal for financial support for the CGIAR Center Genebanks in 2011 as detailed in the proposal be accepted. The ISPC noted the following:

- The ISPC did not find it necessary to undertake an external review of the proposal;
- Results of the costing study are obtained based on methods specifically developed for the study.
- ISPC felt that the method for estimating the costs was robust and appropriate. It endorsed the estimates that were made, including those for one-time costs.

**Discussion:**

- Fund Council members strongly supported the Genebank CRP proposal, commenting that the opportunity cost of not investing in the genebanks is too high. However, stressed the need for a long term strategy for financing genebanks.
- Possibility of expanding the Genebank CRP proposal could be considered (beyond maintenance and distribution) recognizing the uniqueness of the work.
- On the cost per accession ranging from \$8/- to \$851/-, it was clarified that the most important factor affecting the individual accession cost was the periodicity of regeneration. Vegetatively-propagated crops also incur significantly higher costs per accession than seed crops due to the large amount of skilled labor required for in-vitro conservation
- The link between CGIAR and national genebanks, particularly on CGIAR mandated crops is not evident in the study. In addition to monetary contributions, national systems related to genebanks could be supported by the Centers through collaboration and technical partnerships.
- A concern was expressed that Genebank costs would fall disproportionately on Window 1 donors. Other funding options including GCDT, Window 2 or 3 funding as well as funding from the core genebank of a specific Center are to be fully explored.
- Some donors may have difficulty in contributing to Window 1, but may be willing to share the burden of the genebanks and hence should have the opportunity to do so through Window 2.
- Clarification was sought around the interpretation of the costing - whether it is consistent with the way the CRPs, particularly those with greater dependence on genetic resources have developed their costings and whether there are any unwanted implications out of this

process. It was clarified that the costs of the genebanks that are related to research are integrated in the budget requests of the relevant CRPs.

### **Proposed Budget (Maintenance and Distribution) of Genebank Proposal**

(in \$ million)

	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Fund Council Allocated Component: Window 1 and Window 2	13.1	13.3	13.6	40.0
Window 3 and Bilateral Component	2.2	2.2	2.2	6.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	15.2	15.5	15.9	46.6

### **Conclusion and Decision:**

- *Broad support was expressed to fund the genebanks; however ad hoc funding is not a responsible way to fund genebanks. Hence, it is critical for the CGIAR to find a way to have long term surety and a sufficient endowment for this important material for mankind.*
- *The FC approved \$15.2m for maintenance and distribution of the Genebanks in 2011, and would take on advisement the costs for the one- time activities.*
- *The FC Chair and the CB Chair will discuss with potential donors from private and public sectors to mobilize funding support for the genebanks and will call upon the CGIAR Fund Donor representatives when doing so. The FC Chair will discuss with external sources to ascertain the feasibility of running the CGIAR genebanks from the CGIAR Fund for 3 years, during which time more stable funding in the form of an endowment could be established.*
- *The FC Chair will have individual discussions with donors who may not be able to contribute to Window 2 and would otherwise have contributed to Window 1, as there is a general consensus that Window 2 is the acceptable option. The FC Chair will revert to the FC on the appropriate Window (i.e. Window 1 or Window 2) for funding the Genebanks proposal.*

### **Agenda Item 17. Inception Report of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement**

John Markie, the Team Leader of the Design Team for the IEA made a presentation on the Inception Report. The background to the consultancy and CGIAR's evaluation experience were explained. The presentation also focused on the evaluation coverage in the CGIAR, review and performance reporting and the main functions of an IEA Office were elaborated. The Design Team requested the FC for endorsement of the proposals as set out in the Inception Report, Establishment of a CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA).

Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary reminded the FC of the decision taken at the 2009 CGIAR Business Meeting for the new Fund to have an independent evaluation arrangement, once the Fund Office and the Consortium were functioning. The Inception Report looks at the preliminary design of the independent evaluation arrangement.

In order to frame the Fund Council discussion, the following points were highlighted:

- Divergence from the original TOR with respect to designing the "totality" of the CGIAR evaluation function, including IEA (section 7.1 and TOR in annex 9)

- Proposed institutional architecture of the CGIAR evaluation function overall, and the functions and characteristics of the proposed IEA office in particular (section 6).

***Discussion:***

- The CB Chair reminded the FC that the decision of the Business Meeting in 2009 gave functions of M&E to the Consortium Board, the Fund Council and to an independent arrangement which created overlaps, bureaucracy and additional costs.
- The CB suggested that commissioning a study was the right approach as it was an opportunity to provide guidance on the most efficient and effective way in which the roles of monitoring and evaluation by the different governance structures of the CGIAR could be organized for the benefit of the CGIAR System as a whole.
- The CB Chair requested that the IEA be effective, dynamic and look at the CGIAR System as a whole. He supports the proposal put forward by the Design Team.
- FC Members requested an opportunity to go through the proposal in-depth and provide comments by an agreed upon date.

***Conclusions:***

- FC members will revert to the Fund Office on their views regarding divergence from the original TOR with respect to designing the "totality" of the CGIAR evaluation function, including IEA (section 7.1 and TOR in annex 9); the proposed institutional architecture of the CGIAR evaluation function overall, and the functions and characteristics of the proposed IEA office in particular (section 6).
- Based on feedback received, the IEA Design Team will revise the Inception Report, and submit the revised document to the Fund Council for virtual approval in May. A progress report is expected to be submitted to the FC for its July meeting.

**Agenda Item 18. Any Other Business:**

- Latest version of Rules of Procedure require to be posted on the Fund website
- Intellectual Property Rights be included as an agenda item at the next FC meeting
- Documents for the FC need to be distributed in a timely manner
- FO in consultation with CO to develop disbursement profiles for the approved CRPs as soon as possible
- Suggestions on FC meetings:
  - CGIAR Center every year.
  - FC and the Consortium Board have one back to back meeting every year.
- Receive ISPC comments as soon as possible for the four CRP proposals that were presented at the FC4 meeting. This will enable the proponents to be prepared to answer queries at the next FC meeting.

**Concluding Remarks**

The Chair remarked that the CGIAR System has a collective responsibility not to undermine the reforms as it could lead to loss of confidence by the donors and urges centers and center representatives not to undermine the reform in their engagement with donors. There is a need to hold each other accountable to make the system simple and the CGIAR a dynamic, flexible and accountable system that captures every efficiency and reinforces the reforms.

In the context of the G-20 the French Presidency has put significant emphasis on agricultural productivity and price volatility. The G-20 meets in June; hence FC members were requested to

ensure that the brief written for their Head of State has a clear mention of the significance and importance of the contribution of the CGIAR to ensure agricultural productivity over time.

## **Annex 1**

### **CRP1.1 – Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable in Dry Areas**

#### **A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC**

##### **CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions**

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed; proponents should take the time needed to do the due diligence
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

#### **B. ‘Must haves’**

##### **From ISPC<sup>1</sup>:**

1. Clearly characterize the target dryland systems. The proposal must define dryland areas of the developing world and identify geospatial distribution using a water balance approach that quantifies risk and severity of water shortage as the basis for categorizing regions that fall into the “reduce vulnerability” focus of SRT1, or the “sustainable intensification” focus of SRT2;
2. Establish clear set of hypotheses as an organizing principle to help prioritize the research and results agenda.
3. Provide the criteria for choice of benchmark sites and the development of relevant data to inform research requirements in both the biophysical and social sciences, and their synthesis;
4. Refine site selection and characterization and prioritize activities to be carried out, working from impacts to activities;
5. Provide more detail on the underpinning science and agronomic, genetic, and farming system approaches to be evaluated once the first phase has progressed;

---

<sup>1</sup> More detailed commentary is posted on the FC 4 website as:  
[http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc4\\_ISPC\\_commentary\\_CRP1.1.pdf](http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc4_ISPC_commentary_CRP1.1.pdf)

6. Provide a more comprehensive theory of how social change will result from the livelihood, gender and innovations systems approaches espoused in the current proposal;
7. Discuss current research priorities and how they would inform and complement new initiatives

**From FC Members:**

8. Identify clearly the research interventions proposed as a result of the diagnosis of the problems
9. Describe the framework of selecting external and centers' partners, their respective research activities, how these activities collectively contribute to an integrated agro-ecosystem research agenda
10. Differentiate the roles of the crop/commodity CRPs and this system CRP
11. Integrate available lessons learned from SSA-CP
12. Develop a log frame and articulate impact pathways to explicitly link a cluster of outputs to outcomes, and impacts and to SRF system level outcomes
13. Include a performance management framework
14. Build climate variability resilience and sustainable dry land systems through an integrated program combining indigenous knowledge with improved technologies, information dissemination and engagement with stakeholders
15. Redefine management structure to ensure that the Steering Committee (strategic oversight) and the Research Management Committee (manage research) are not both chaired by the DG for the lead center to avoid potential conflict of interest
16. Broaden the focus of the proposal to include Latin America and South Asia (cereal system)

## CRP2 Proposal – Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor

### C. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY III - Re-submission of the proposal with Substantial revisions

#### CATEGORY III: Re-submission of the CRP proposal

- Substantial ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

#### D. ‘Must haves’

##### From ISPC<sup>2</sup>:

1. Identify and elaborate key problems and opportunities for research on specific agricultural and rural development policies, investments, institutions and markets that offer greatest scope for measurable progress towards CGIAR goals;
2. Further develop a strategic framework that encompasses, *inter alia*,
  - clearer articulation of priorities and rationale for them,
  - an assessment of alternative research providers and CGIAR comparative advantage, and
  - a clear focus on production of well-defined and high priority International Public Goods;
3. Apply the strategic framework to develop a more focused and coherent research program around major constraints and opportunities that references earlier IFPRI work;
4. Elaborate more specifically the key outcomes and impacts being targeted by sub-themes at different scales (global, regional, national) or activities, and their impact pathway narratives;
5. Elaborate further the specific roles and synergies of IFPRI and other CGIAR and non-CGIAR partners working together, and independence of the Scientific Advisory Panel;

##### From FC Members:

6. Identify the value added by the proposed work in CRP2;

<sup>2</sup> More detailed commentary is posted on the FC 4 website as:  
[http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc4\\_ISPC\\_Commentary\\_CRP2.pdf](http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/fc4_ISPC_Commentary_CRP2.pdf)

7. Focus on core competencies and comparative advantage of CRP2;
8. Move from generic outputs to measurable ones with indicators that can be linked to specific timeframes;
9. Provide convincing story on how research outputs will be converted into development outcomes;
10. Articulate how the consortium will partner with and complement the social science work in the commodity and resource-based CGIAR centers;
11. Form close and integral partnership with the platforms and networks brought together through GFAR and regional bodies;
12. Clarify boundaries of foresight work relative to the one being undertaken by ISPC
13. CRP2 should identify data gaps and how to increase efficiency in collecting data in different countries;
14. Consider research areas that seek to better understand the urban-rural poor interface.