



4th Meeting of the Independent Science Partnership Council

14-16 September 2011
International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)
El Batán, Texcoco, MEXICO

END OF MEETING REPORT *(ISPC Secretariat, December 2011)*

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

ISPC Chair, *Ken Cassman* welcomed participants to the meeting. He noted that the ISPC enjoyed the opportunity of the face to face meetings of the Council to also interact with the CGIAR. He thanked CIMMYT for the opportunity to hold the meeting in Mexico. This was an important meeting for the ISPC as, amongst other things, the Council would be examining future directions in a changing CGIAR and he welcomed the input of Center representatives and other observers into this discussion. He welcomed Professor Bhavani Shankar to his first full meeting as a SPIA panel member.

Tom Lumpkin, the Director-General of CIMMYT welcomed participants. He noted that CIMMYT had been one of the key Green Revolution Centers but, as the food price rises of 2008 had shown, there was still a large scientific challenge to ensure effective production of food by developing countries. CIMMYT enjoyed especially good relations with its host Government of Mexico who had become a major donor to the Center, and to South Asia where new institutional developments were taking place. He felt that the CGIAR transition process had caused a lot of stress at a time when these big challenges to food security were evident. He suggested that the ISPC had an important role to play, particularly in bringing scientific groups together. With the revised mandate of the Council there was an opportunity to help incentivise such collaborations, rather than simply through the “stick” of the former review process.

Agenda Item 2. Update on the CGIAR

Ken Cassman (ISPC Chair) noted that the Council’s role was to provide Independent Program Review (through the ex ante review of new system programs); strategic thinking as a contribution to the Strategy and Trends and prioritization of the CGIAR portfolio; and activities to promote Mobilizing Science, where the Council’s role was to help create effective partnerships; and in ex post Impact Assessment.

Cassman said that the review of 13 (anticipated) CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) in 2011 created a major load on the Council which nevertheless had established a schedule to meet the requirements of the Fund Council. The ISPC particularly conducted its reviews with respect to science quality, but that, according to reviews to date, the CGIAR Programs were still at an early stage of development and there were several emerging trends:

- There are common issues in governance and management of the CRPs;
- There are immediate needs to plan directly for their evaluation and assessment - as the system was still developing the Independent Assessment Arrangement, time frames and methods needed to be put in place otherwise it would be difficult to establish benchmarks for CRP performance;
- CRP proposals were too dependent on descriptions of current activities. Whilst the Council recognised the need to recognise bilateral donor project requirements, in terms of the reformation we needed to see new scientific directions and constellations to alleviate constraints leading to the proposed CGIAR outcomes.

The Chair reviewed the Agenda, and repeated his invitation for input into the ISPC's WorkPlan and Budget (WP&B) both from the participants to the current meeting and also from DGs and CRP directors in the future.

Ganesan Balachander of the Consortium Board (CB), reflecting on the remarks of the CIMMYT DG, said that the CB had shared in the pain of the Centers during the transition. However, he saw much progress in the move from a loose arrangement of Centers to a new systematic way of working with new upstream and downstream partners. He reported on the recent CB Meeting at CIAT noting that now the CB had endorsed all 15 CRPs although they had not all yet been subject to the FC decision process. He believed that it would be important to work with the ISPC on the process to build a foresight dimension into the Strategic Results Framework (SRF). It would be important to (i) address overlaps in the CRPs and to arrange meetings between these CRPs, (ii) work on the selection of common sites and common methods, (iii) to produce "easyCRP" the database which would facilitate program management. Noting large advances over where the Consortium was just a year before, he reported on the special effort to include gender in the CRPs (following on from the Gender Scoping Study commissioned by the CB) through gender analysis, gender staffing policy and capacity building. A gender specialist had been appointed by the Consortium Office. He further reported the efforts to initiate Consortium-level monitoring principles and the monitoring of CRPs. The Independent Evaluation Office would be responsible for all CRP evaluations except sub-components to be managed by the CRP themselves. A CRP review would be carried out every 3-5 years. CRPs had 6 months to identify team members for the monitoring task and to ensure that monitoring was fully mainstreamed.

In response to questions, he suggested that a new SRF would be required in two year's time. He further noted that the IEO would be involved in evaluation but the CRPs in monitoring. The Consortium Office would be the "glue" for CRP interaction. However, ISPC members felt that it would be difficult to separate monitoring and evaluation when it came to an appreciation of the quality of science, which would not be captured by results databases. Extending the monitoring principles to partners and dealing with partners in a systematic way (e.g. through the CGIAR IP principles) were challenges to be addressed. Jonathan Wadsworth of the Fund Office noted the difficulty of dealing currently with the general nature of CRPs since for CRP agreements to be signed for funding; a Performance and Indicator Matrix had had to be designed by the first four CRPs. These would possibly need to be reviewed as system monitoring goes ahead. Certainly the Fund Council preferred a results-based methodology to be worked out. An observer noted that a role for the ISPC may be to help in the discussion in defining what a CRP may measure and what would be needed at the level of the system - to achieve an alignment between CRP analysis and

higher level monitoring. The ISPC Chair noted that identifying the correct targets for monitoring and the metrics to be used for comparability across the system's efforts would also be important scientific contributions to this goal.

Jonathan Wadsworth of the Fund Office reminded the meeting that reasons for the CGIAR change process started in 2008 were to respond to the external challenges of increasing food prices, energy crisis, emerging climate change issues, including the declining yield growth, and the slow increase in world food production. The CGIAR's internal Challenges included needs for a new vision and strategy for this emerging situation; a focused research agenda; streamlined governance and stronger accountability; more dynamic and broadened partnerships; and increased harmonization and coordination among investors. He noted that development of the Global Research Programs was underway; by the end of the November FC meeting, all 15 CRPs (included in the current research portfolio of the Consortium and as described in the SRF) would have been discussed. All 5 CRP proposals that received conditional approvals (Category II) at FC4 and FC5 are expected to be submitted to the FC for approval on a "no-objection" basis during the last quarter of 2011. Disbursements have been made to two CRPs that started their implementation in Jan 2011: CCAFS-\$12.6m from W2; GRiSP – \$4.7m from W2 (in addition, \$10m disbursement from W1 to GRiSP is in process), processing of other endorsed CRPs were in process subject to confirmation of the Performance Indicators Matrix for each.

The CGIAR multi-donor Fund will improve the quality and quantity of funding by harmonizing donor contributions for a common agenda. It gives donors a new low-cost vehicle for results-based investments in international research on big issues – (increases investment "critical mass") and an incentive to reduce the plethora of restricted projects and focus resources on agreed priorities. Window 1 of the Fund was for Fund Council-designated system costs and CRPs; Window 2 was for donor-designated funds for CRPs; and Window 3 for donor-designated funds for Centers linked to their work on CRPs identified in the SRF. Whilst reporting on current progress with funds and funder membership he noted that a donor meeting is planned for 2012 to seek agreement on a more secure way of receiving multiyear donor pledges. The rate of donor entry into the CGIAR Fund is high with 70% of top twenty donors to the CGIAR already in the CGIAR Fund. He reported that the Fund Office was working with the CO to derive a detailed report on bilateral funding received by the Centers in 2011 and a plan for monitoring current multi-year bilateral contracts to ensure alignment with, and absorption into, CRPs.

He suggested that part of the advantage of the reform would be to create efficiency and effectiveness in the CGIAR. A start was being made to towards greater scrutiny and alignment of System Costs; standard comparable financials of all CRP Proposals; and the One Corporate System (OCS)—a multi-Center, project management, financial accounting and HR system. He concurred with the Chair that efficient evaluation technologies, would include better metrics. The sum total of the reform would be to ensure increased and sustained investment of the CGIAR. He suggested that to achieve a food-secure world by 2025 requires that agricultural productivity grow at a rate of 0.5% annually over baseline. To achieve this growth rate, investment in public agricultural research for development needs to expand from \$5.1 billion per year now to USD \$16.4 billion by 2025. International agricultural research for development carried out by CGIAR currently accounts for 10% of the public investment in developing countries. The current goal is a doubling of CGIAR funding in five years (2008-2013).

Agenda item 3: Report on Science Forum

Jeff Sayer, ISPC leading member for the “Mobilizing Science” activities, presented an update on the Science Forum 2011 “The Agriculture–Environment Nexus” (17-19 October, Beijing, China), being organized in collaboration with the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS) and Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR). The event is very cost-effective, with a budget of only 150,000 USD complemented by additional support provided by CAAS to cover local venue and logistical expenses.

Sayer began with a short description of the previous Science Forum in 2009, including its main output, a special and highly cited edition of the journal *Crop Science*. He also explained that, as a general rule, the Science Forum (SF) attempts to address themes of general interest for all CGIAR Centers, creating a space where scientists can gather to openly discuss on issues for which no other forum is already in place.

Sayer explained the background and goals of the forthcoming SF, which aims at bringing together a wide range of perspectives from scientists, practitioners, policymakers and funding agents, to redouble and refocus efforts to achieve the goal of decoupling rises in food production from environmental degradation demands, refocusing agricultural research and developing new kinds of partnerships. At the same time, the event will also try to reach out to Chinese academic community and to create a bridge between several relevant environmental organizations (e.g. IUCN, UNEP) and the CGIAR research community.

Seventy-six speakers have been selected basing on the quality and relevance of their science. Similarly to what happened in 2009, it is proposed that high quality papers presented at the Forum will be included in a special issue of a high-impact journal. A policy brief reporting the most important conclusions of the Forum is also being planned.

The event will host approximately 300 participants, 27% from CGIAR Centers, 30% from Chinese universities and research organizations and the remainder distributed among external scientists and research institutions, development organizations, NGOs and private sector from different countries and regions. Although Europe, North America and China represent a large percentage of the participants’ geographical distribution (68%), Africa, other Asian countries and South America are also represented. Youth is represented, with 12 young scientists sponsored by ISPC; however, despite several efforts made, the representation of women still remains low (18%).

Sayer acknowledged Christine Deane, of the ISPC Secretariat, for the large amount of work done in preparation of this important event.

In discussion, the importance of using this event to interact with Chinese scientists was reinforced and he noted that Chinese scientists would present in different sessions and workshops. Reflections were also made on the possibility of using the Science Forum in the future as a venue to link science to the organization of a more formal fund-raising event for the CGIAR. However, the ISPC believes that whilst the participation of donors in the SF is welcomed, and prefers that the event keep its identity as one of the few venues for purely scientific debates at the system level on agriculture and poverty alleviation. Noting the relation between increasing farm size, poverty alleviation and global economy suggestions were made that the Science Forum might address this issue in one of its future editions.

Agenda item 4: NRM Stripe Review

The ISPC Chair opened the agenda item noting that both the plans for the “Natural resources management research challenges and way forward for the new CGIAR – a Stripe Review“ (NRMR Stripe Review) and the Science Forum were started by the previous Science Council, and that, thanks to the work of Jeff Sayer, these activities represented continuity with the previous setting. The Chair reminded the meeting that this review does not aim at evaluating the NRM research per se, but more at providing understanding of what worked in the past to create impacts at scale, so that we can learn and address new issues in the future.

Jeff Sayer reported on the progress of the NRMR Stripe Review, starting with a short history of the past NRM discussions within CGIAR, from the TAC to external reviews and to the INRM task force (chaired by Sayer himself) and noting that many papers and books were produced, but each one with different interpretation of NRM. Sayer noted that similarly to the Science Forum, this activity had a relatively low budget.

Sayer stressed that, while advancing the study the difficulty and vastness of the task were clearly evident. The new CGIAR mission of “sustaining the environment” involves that the majority of the Centers which deal with natural resources as part of their crop improvement approaches – not only the conventional NRM Centers - although often addressing it with different terminology and approaches. Sayer explained the conceptual framework for the Stripe Review and noted that the work to date (development of four draft issues papers, a bibliometric study and a literature review of past assessments and an analysis of ISPC archives on Center outcomes) would feed into the Science Forum sessions and, especially into the NRMR Stripe Review workshop (planned for 16 October 2011, Beijing China). The events in Beijing will represent the first real interaction of the study with the Centers, which was paused at the Centers’ request in the past months due to their very high work load for the preparation of the CRPs. The material presented at the Science Forum will be in the form of drafts or material to stimulate discussions, and will be finalized only after these important consultations. A writing retreat is planned to take place after that, to prepare the final output of the Stripe Review, a strategic paper designed to assist in focusing the program and defining the role of the CGIAR in the production of NRM outcomes at scale for the Consortium. Sayer thanked Ms Fortuna of the ISPC Secretariat, for work being done for this Study.

In discussion, the participants welcomed the initiative and its timing, and highlighted the importance of determining the IPG value of research in this area and to what extent the results of CGIAR Centers rested on successful partnership. Fortuna noted that such information was being captured - together with the categorization of the NRM research in CGIAR - in a database, which would remain available also for future studies. On the issues of metrics, Sayer suggested that probably, instead of having specific metrics for NRM, the most appropriate approach would be to have metrics for poverty and see how NRM could influence these results. Research on this topic needs to be continued and it is hoped that the Science Forum could help to bring clarity.

The ISPC Chair concluded by reinforcing the message that the success of this and other reviews would depend on the level of collaboration of the rest of the CGIAR System and he therefore encouraged the Centers and the Consortium to actively engage in order to produce an output that would be of value to the whole system.

Agenda item 5: CRP 3.6 Dryland cereals

Óscar Riera-Lizarazu, Program Director at ICRISAT, the lead Center of CRP3.6 (Dryland cereals), presented the CRP proposal. The CRP covers four cereal crops: barley, finger millet, pearl millet and sorghum in four major developing regions. It brings together ICRISAT and ICARDA, and several national, ARI and private sector partners and incorporates research done in the Generation CP. Riera-Lizarazu explained the rationale for building a program around these crops, in terms of volume and value of production in developing countries, and future demand for these crops. He also discussed the challenges and opportunities to which the CRP innovations respond: genetic advances; stresses to be addressed; food, feed and nutritional demands; and adoption. By 2020 the CRP aims at a 15% increase in dryland cereal farm-level production, and it has set targets for the area, number of farmers and income benefits. There are six strategic objectives (SO) with two SOs (research targeting and development of genomics tools) contributing to the crop improvement and management SOs, complemented by SOs on post harvest technologies and delivery. Riera-Lizarazu also explained how capacity needs and gender issues are addressed in the CRP.

The comments and questions from the ISPC members and observers and the discussion focused on the following issues:

- The basis of the 15% increase estimate needs more clarity regarding how much is built on earlier research, yield potential, variability among the crops, the role of agronomic practices vs. genetics; and what is in the pipeline for the integrated breeding platforms. Yield gap seems to be a major bottleneck.
- The breeding platform, aimed at improving the efficiency of breeding, combines bioinformatics and data management tools (genotypic and phenotypic) for informing breeders on optimal selections for improving the. Seed delivery systems are a bottleneck in Africa, while in India seed companies are starting to operate even in harsh areas. Quality of seed will be a challenge for both hybrids and other varieties.
- Projections for demand were thought to be quite high considering that human consumption in general is going down. Obviously feed demand also contributes to the estimates and if so the attribution to the SLOs would need to be better explained. According to the CRP, population growth is expected to drive demand. Vulnerability of the regions targeted is a major motivation for the CRP.
- In clarification of why barley is in the CRP, the proponents argued that several factors are common between barley, sorghum and millet, particularly traits of interest and the dryland problematics.
- Better analysis is needed of what is occurring in SSA regarding substitution between maize and the dryland cereals, area expansion and changes in cropping systems. This is valuable for this CRP to explore, as currently limited data are available.
- Regarding CRP interactions, CRP 3.6 and CRP 3.7 work on fodder nutrition, value trade-offs and value added from improving digestibility, processing and marketing. With CRP1.1 (dry areas) linkages should be addressed during implementation.
- Crop-specific breeding strategies and targets need further elaboration.
- The approach towards NARS needs developing through sufficient consultations.
- More clarity is needed on activities that depend on additional funding (“funding gap”) or the CRP needs to justify a request for full funding.

Agenda item 6: CRP on Grain Legumes

On behalf of four CGIAR Centers working on grain legumes (ICRISAT, ICARDA, IITA and CIAT), *C L Gowda* presented to the ISPC the CRP 3.5 proposal on “Leveraging legumes to combat poverty, hunger, malnutrition and environmental degradation”. Eight legume crops (beans, chickpeas, cowpea, fababean, groundnut, lentil, pigeonpea, and soybean) have been prioritized in each of the five target regions. The vision of success for this CRP hinges on this research resulting in a 20% increase in yields on at least 20% area (12.5 m ha) sown to grain legumes in target domains, generating a 6-to-1 rate of return on investment. To provide context and relevance to the CGIAR SLOs, CL Gowda described the key challenges and opportunities with respect to grain legumes and the specific research innovations relevant here. The presentation focused on six key strategic objectives for this CRP—and the lessons learnt and specific research questions related to these: (i) Genetic and Genomic Resources/Tools (ii) Accelerated Cultivar Development (iii) Improved Crop and Pest Management Practices (iv) Efficient Seed Production and Delivery Systems; (v) Enhance Grain Legume Value Chains, and (vi) Partnerships, Capacities and Knowledge Sharing.

Aspects related to gender strategy, capacity strengthening, partnerships (internal to CGIAR and external) and a monitoring and evaluation plan were also described. The management structure – Consortium Board, Lead Center, Steering Committee, Research Management Team, etc. – is similar to that of other emerging CRPs. A three year (2011-2013) budget of US\$137 million has been proposed.

The Chair opened the discussion to ISPC members and observers. The following points were discussed:

- Concerning the phrase ‘climate change ready crops’, members questioned the use of this term and whether in fact legumes can play a significant role in adapting to climate change (any evidence to date?). The rationale given was that historically legumes have been planted and have had to adapt under relatively harsh conditions, therefore, one would expect them to be able to adapt under variable climatic conditions in the future.
- With respect to whether and how priorities have been set within and across the regions and crops, priority setting discussions with partners had already been carried out and a system is in place for further prioritization if needs be. Indeed, some legume crops, such as mungbeans, had already been dropped from the agenda after a prioritization exercise for crops.
- With respect to the ‘too-modest’ vision of success statement, and the need to aim higher and target higher yield achievement across legume growing areas, CL Gowda reminded the group that legumes should not be compared to cereals; they are typically secondary crops and rarely receive much in terms of inputs and labor. Hence, achieving 20% yield on 20% of the area by 2020 would be a notable achievement. The Chair made the point that a 0.4% annual yield gain in legumes compares favorably with a 1% yield gain in cereals if one considers that the former produces so much more oil and protein than cereals, so one need appropriate proximal analysis, not simply kgs of yield.
- The Generation Challenge Program (GCP), although not mentioned in the presentation, is a key partner in this CRP. GCP will end in 2014/15, however, and consideration needs to be given for realizing a smooth transition. Ultimately the GCP work would be taken over by respective CRPs.

The Chair thanked Gowda for giving a clear and succinct presentation of the CRP 3.5 proposal and for responding to the discussion points.

Agenda Item 7. CRP 1.2 Humid Tropics

Paula Bramel of IITA presented the CRP 1.2 Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics. The objectives of Humidtropics (when capitalized as one word referring to the program proposal) are to provide increased economic and social returns for the poor and vulnerable people from enhanced agricultural productivity; the improved biological and ecological integrity of natural resources and improved institutional effectiveness in supporting the poor and vulnerable people. Bramel described several of the underpinning ideas that the program had developed (some in concert with the University of Wageningen, Netherlands). She illustrated a Humidtropics Systems Framework, a Humidtropics Conceptual Framework, and a framework of poverty and environmental degradation status for analyzing site choice. Five global research themes had been proposed: 1. Situation and Policy Analysis, 2. Integrated systems improvement (made up of three components or sub-themes i.e. institutional effectiveness, systems productivity and NR integrity, and resulting in 5, a Global Synthesis theme. Humidtropics will adopt an R4D Impact Model which clearly differentiates research pathways from development pathways and seeks holistic pathways for impact. Site choice mechanisms based on representativeness of the humid tropic zones in relation to ecoregional scales has led to broad scale selection of areas in East and Central Africa, Southern Africa, West Africa, Central America, Andes, Greater Mekong, “Malay Archipelago”, and “Eastern Ganga”, although, at least initially Africa would receive 80% of the budget (USD 118 of 145 million over three years) largely through existing contracted activities.

Supporting emphases on Partnerships, Capacity building and Communication were described, as was the intention to mainstream gender research and to improve the quality of women participation in research and development processes and reduce gender inequity. Bramel reported that the proposal and its revision are the product of extensive stakeholder consultations between teams of scientists from the partner Centers and others. She recognised the partner responsibilities and risks in a large and complex program. She suggested that the www.humidtropics.org site will be the main platform for information exchange and it is envisioned that more action area-based participatory consultations will take place in both face-to-face and, where feasible, on-line formats. This also implies that the number of participants will continue to grow providing a solid platform for further interventions.

In discussion, the Chair noted that the development of the systems programs was a challenge for the new CGIAR and whilst CRPs 1.1 and 1.3 had strong conceptual elements, both had not yet arrived at a convincing set of activities. ISPC Members noted that here too there was more discussion of the “how” rather than the “what”. However, despite the scarce detail, it was surprising that forests and research on forests, so important to the humid zone globally, were not better represented. Bramel pointed out that the interface with other CRPs still had to be worked out. She further noted in response to questions that whilst action sites were to be refined a lot of base line data did exist from previous work. She confirmed that the program proponents still had to work to provide more definition in sites and activities, but noted the intent to engage with partners in line with the R4D approach. She clarified that lessons learned from the SSA-CP would be incorporated into Humidtropics planning but that Action sites would be broader in the CRP.

Although the ISPC has concerns with the governance structures being proposed for some of the CRPs, the ISPC looks for leadership from the Consortium in these matters. Thought would also have to go into the critical issue of distilling out the best form for the system CRPs as components of the overall portfolio. The ISPC Chair thanked Paula Bramel for her candid presentation of the state of development of the 1.2 CRP proposal.

Agenda item 8: Summary observations on the CRPs

The ISPC discussed the cross-cutting features of the entire portfolio of 15 CRPs which have been submitted for the ISPC's appraisal preceding Fund Council decision on approval. Such a comprehensive analysis across the proposed CGIAR research agenda can help identify the most important issues that still need to be addressed. There is clearly need for a process through which the CRPs can be further improved.

i. Relationships between “Systems” CRPs (1.1 etc) and commodity or multicrop CRPs.

Having assessed all the CRP proposals, the ISPC is concerned that there are limited linkages between CRPs. There is great potential for sharing sites, methodologies, data sets and data management, for instance. With the CGIAR reform, the funding of parallel research activities in the same sites without any linkages should come to an end. However, it is uncertain to what extent there are incentives for CRPs to engage in a process to search for better integration. It was noted that the CRPs have been developed very rapidly and that experience shows that time and a more phased approach is needed. Leadership will be necessary to facilitate the integration process and to harmonize similar work in similar sites. Integration is an issue between all kinds of CRPs, not just systems and commodity-oriented ones. The value chain approach, for instance, is common in several CRPs, not only in CRP2 (policies, institutions and markets).

Originally the motivation in creating systems CRPs was that they would be truly integrated with the commodity CRPs in particular. Systems CRPs were envisioned to generate quick wins in the down stream with focus on hot spots in terms of poverty or natural resource degradation. For commodity CRPs, the incentives should be in the impact pathway linking them to the system CRPs. Instead, the crop CRPs have incorporated delivery components within their own commodity program design. Similarly, the system CRPs will require to conduct needs assessments with partners but the commodity CRPs are already further developed in this task and there is a risk that the two types of CRP will proceed independently.

The meeting was reminded that Challenge Programs were expected to bring better integration across research portfolios. One lesson is that timing needs to be appropriate and thus the CRPs need to have their vertical components clear in order to then build the horizontal linkages for adding value. Shared services, information and data management, and capacity building may have clearer added value across CRPs than research *per se*. Center observers noted that bridge building needs to be structured into the CRP design, and as it depends on scientists, requires both time and resources.

The issues related to data (collection, management and synthesis) are shared by all CRPs. For instance, in areas with endemic poverty the data for understanding what is really happening are sparse (for instance on shifts in land use and cropping area, cropping systems changes etc.). Collecting relevant data and synthesizing it could be a critical role for the systems CRPs in particular. The ISPC was told that during the SRF process the CGIAR Consortium for Spatial Information was involved in data consolidation, but those data were inadequately used.

The ISPC Chair concluded that it is the ISPC's role to highlight these concerns and propose ways of addressing them.

ii. Helicopter view of the CRP portfolio (emerging areas, cross cutting areas, missing science, partnerships, governance)

The ISPC considered a brief synthesis prepared by the Secretariat of issues emerging from the CRP portfolio regarding opportunities for synergy in research and service-type activities (discussed above); variability in the detail in which science and impact pathways are planned and described in CRPs; partnership arrangements and partner capacity; and management arrangements, among others. The ISPC observed that the CRPs were at various stages of readiness. For instance, assessment of science content and science quality was impossible with some CRPs and thus the *ex ante* appraisal could not be properly done. Preparing CRPs has involved a heavy process - to some extent at the cost of content. It is becoming clear that the design phase is not over despite approval from the Fund Council. Approval of CRPs that strategically are not ready can be risky unless there is a mechanism to oversee and foster program development. The main issues include: areas of potential synergies not addressed; development of scientific content and research questions; and the transition from the large number of contract-based projects to a coherent research agenda addressing the CRP objectives. Applying performance contract monitoring and evaluation could be unreasonable in situations where CRPs are still in program formulation phase.

A Center observer supported a role for the ISPC to draw on its comprehensive CRP appraisal by doing a cross-CRP synthesis, which should include identification of areas of synergy, risks and potential for collaboration. It would also be helpful if the ISPC engaged in further guiding review or appraisal in some cases.

The CB representative stated that the CB is aware of these difficulties but optimistic that a System is now forming. With the CRPs approved and the performance agreements in place the CB is optimistic that there will be more space for research to progress and the CRPs will feel the responsibility to act. There will be space for modifications within the next 1-3 years. The CB science task force could meet with the ISPC to think about the monitoring system where warning signals are also needed.

The ISPC Chair concluded that the ISPC is planning to do more synthesis, in addition to the immediate synthesis on governance and management and gender issues requested by the Fund Council for its next meeting in November. There is an opportunity to capture lessons from the large amount of work done. The Chair emphasised how critical it is that the reform will succeed, not only for efficiency but also because of the CGIAR's reputation.

Agenda Item 9: Setting priorities

This agenda item focussed on the role the ISPC might play in supporting the Consortium's requirement to set priorities at the system level and arose from a request by the former Consortium CEO for ISPC assistance on methods, data and approaches that might be used.

Ganesan Balachander of the Consortium Board agreed that such assistance was necessary, although the Consortium would be producing a shorter, essentially marketing brief, of activities based on the current SRF before the next GCARD in Uruguay in 2012.

The ISPC undertook to include an item in its workplan noting the considerable efforts that had gone into previous prioritisation activities (and even into earlier versions of the SRF - see item 10). There was a need to take account of these and the available data (mostly for crops and of variable accuracy across the different crops). There was an opportunity now to draw on the foresight studies

of others and be more systematic in the identification and treatment of required data. Thus the ISPC would be reviewing prioritization methods and data requirements in support of the Consortium's responsibility for SRF development.

The discussion noted that there was a need for advice on the higher level system indicators against which the systems performance against the SRF could be measured. The Chair noted that the establishment and publication of "gold standards" for such measures would be an IPG in itself.

Item 10. Brainstorming on ISPC role and aspects for foresight

The Chair noted that the Agenda Item was designed to encourage debate and input from observers about the best stance and activities that the ISPC might take to fulfill its role in providing advice to the Consortium on strategic issues, trends affecting agriculture and environmental research and the mobilization of the best available talent around these themes. He noted that the practical outcome from the discussion would be the new ISPC workplan and the opportunity to look ahead for 2012/13.

i. Data to support priority setting—example, Harvest Choice

Drawing on recent work of Harvest Choice, *Stan Wood* (IFPRI) provided an overview of some relevant foresight components and capacities within the Consortium in his presentation entitled "Data and Tools to Support Consistent Accounting, Spillover, and Aggregation Analysis in a Cross-CRP Framework". The Harvest Choice project has generated a systematic and comprehensive compilation of (increasingly spatially explicit) baseline conditions and trends in relation to environments, production contexts, production systems, (high-res) land cover, population, poverty, market access/prices, resource stocks and flow. Ultimately data and modelling efforts should translate into better decision making. The database thus far has been used:

- To improve the characterization of production systems and as a basis for a broader definition of "productivity";
- In biophysical modelling of change, e.g., potential productivity/ intensification options and responses;
- In linking projected biophysical productivity responses to valuation and economic evaluation frameworks;
- To project land use, production, market, and welfare outcomes from (local to global, partial to general equilibrium modelling (aggregate quantity and price accounting).

A number of practical examples were given but one in particular is the "*IMPACT/Water Global Food Projections Model*" with a 2005 baseline and ~300 FPU's. This model has been the basis for many initiatives (e.g., expanded biofuels production/market modelling, land cover change modelling to examine footprint of change, and a dynamic linkages to CGE modelling framework). In terms of integration, the macro, meso and micro data are linked in an analytical hierarchy in the 300 FPU's – aligning infrastructure /markets access with production systems with ecosystem services and demographics. Spatial covariates/proxies and analytical flows are used in examining relationships between hunger, poverty and productivity. All this is available to the public (a BMFG requirement), so researchers can do their own analyses with these web enabled tools.

With respect to the ISPC's roles in foresight, Wood emphasized the importance of periodic strategic evaluation of the Consortium's research agenda and the need to consider the key scientific questions to help shape subsequent iterations of the SRF. In this respect there is a role to play in the following areas: (a) commissioning foresight studies to address the defined questions /hypotheses, drawing predominantly on capacities based within the CRPs, i.e., tapping into the Consortium's own

capacity to perform strategic analysis; (b) independently review the data, methods, tools and outputs of commissioned foresight studies to ensure they adhere to best practices and draw on best scientific data and knowledge; (c) auditing ‘scientific coherence’, i.e., based on its unique scientific overview of the entire Consortium portfolio, identify areas where greater scientific coherence and cost-effectiveness might be achieved; and (d) leading a scientific approach to data gathering, curation and sharing as a key Consortium IPG¹. It was suggested that data is much too valuable a corporate (IPG) asset to be left to individual researchers, programs, and Centers but it will be challenging and costly to develop technical, institutional and cultural transformation and platforms needed (but promising role models in GCP, CSI, and HarvestChoice exist).

The discussion was lively and far reaching. ISPC members commended this strategic effort within the HC initiative—highly pertinent to ISPC goals with respect to foresight analysis. While not all of the issues raised and addressed can be summarized here, a few key ones include:

- Databases and models – quality, reliability and credibility issues: it’s essential that there is transparency (source, methods, etc.) with the ability for others to check and validate databases. When there is a central database, who has the responsibility to validate it for the System? The databases and analyses used by HC are publicly available and all underlying maps and information are downloadable. Feedback mechanisms are provided.
- An ‘open data’ policy for the CGIAR is well advised – a standardized format for open data to allow the public to use new data, parameter estimates and do analyses. As a cross CGIAR activity, the key critical issues are harmonization of data, protocols, and coding. It’s really about changing mindsets; institutional issues are key, not necessarily the hardware. Generation CP and CIAT experience, however, suggests that data management is a major challenge; numerous non-trivial difficulties exist in relation to documentation, standards and protocols and quality control. The ‘central registry’ concept (global database) did not work for GCP – rather the program had to build on what Centers were doing (community databases), i.e., provide a platform and encourage common practices, which then allows tapping into any database. This adds large overall value.
- At the same time, there are certain parameters (and data required to underpin these) that are so essential for monitoring and measuring progress towards SLOs, that standards and requirements (global coordination) are necessary.
- There is a need to operationalize the policy on management of data and intellectual property rights. This is an area the ISPC could help with.
- Need for understanding the nature of ‘foresight’ – it is not a background study, but rather an exercise, a procedure, a (ideally, participatory) process, which allows more collective intelligence to be mobilized in the decision making process.
- The HC database structure has focused primarily on crop and to a lesser extent animal production and their systems. Ecosystem services have not been addressed. At the same time, most of the relevant environmental variables are there so, in theory, looking at environmental outputs is possible.
- This presentation amply demonstrates the existing capacity and competency in the System already (across Centers/CRPs). ISPC must determine where and how it can add value in the area of foresight. As much still needs to be done in the area of priority setting, this is probably a key area to focus on. SPIA’s model – which has worked reasonably well in the past, i.e., of engaging Centers and outside expertise with SPIA involvement for oversight and quality control, may have relevance here for the ISPC.
- With respect to the outside expertise, recognizing the different perspectives and ideologies across the spectrum (on issues such as genetic engineering, low energy input agriculture,

¹ Encompassed in the maxim: *bring the CG genebank mentality to the CG “databank”*

conservation, etc.), choosing the right people for panels or for commissioning white papers, is critical to achieving a sound (less biased) analysis. ISPC role in achieving a ‘balanced’ outlook/outcome is key. This emphasizes again the importance of maintaining transparency with respect to data and methods.

- The CGIAR (and ISPC accordingly) needs to do more analysis/vision building from outside in rather than vice-versa. There is a continuing need to interact with others outside the CGIAR.

The chair summarized the session by emphasizing that data such as crop area and production, environmental variables, etc. are so fundamental, they must be published (the gold standard) and be in the public domain. The question remains as to what the ISPC could do to add value to the wide ranging databases within the CGIAR. Three roles were suggested: (1) champion the need and value of having an open data policy; (2) reinforcing the gold standard for the System and global databases (publication and transparency) in terms of agriculture production and environment nexus; and, (3) help operationalize the Consortium policy on IPR.

ii. Prospective activities for the ISPC

In this general discussion, criteria for ISPC were not formally considered although the debate was wide ranging around the stance that the ISPC might adopt and the activities that might be included in the workplan². *Rashid Hassan* led the discussion noting that many of the things the system and the ISPC do have elements of foresight and strategy; the question is how this might best be developed *in toto*. The Science Forum has components of foresight as do *ex post* impact assessments the NRM study, there is a strategic component study suggested in the CRP2 proposal etc. but there is a need to know what else might be required to fill out the picture sufficient for the SRF or to address gaps in the portfolio. The ISPC needs to choose its focus according to the highest priority that is consistent with the role and mandate of ISPC. Part of the overall picture is determining where the poor are, how dependent on agriculture, aspects of the environment (and ecosystem services), water, biodiversity, what are the key eco-system indicators that need to be developed. Outputs of NRM study will yield suggestions (this is just one area). The Chair sought suggestions from the group on what kind of foresight activities the ISPC should focus on.

Sayer suggested that the foresight contribution of the Science Fora should be made explicit. Certainly topics taken from the agriculture and environment nexus debate would be worthy of further development in consideration of both the new SRF and how the research might be tackled. Council shared the perception that an overview and analysis of all CRPs would similarly highlight elements that needed fuller understanding of drivers and potential consequences for the attainment of the SLOs. Part of this assessment is that the impact pathway or influence pathway, critical need for identifying *ex-ante* the key clients, engagement with clients and developing a strategy for uptake. Currently the nutrition and health SLOs stretch the CGIAR (and specifically CRP 4) in understanding how these will be met. We need to think through where the best entry point(s) for the CGIAR might be.

One observer noted the ISPC’s role was to make uptake of research results more likely. By considering this from a foresight angle and advising on best strategy this it would not be stepping into the monitoring and review area or out of remit. Clearly there was much work that needed to be done on the CRPs in the transitional period moving from current work to future strategy.

² Only a few of the elements are included in this report and readers are referred to the ISPC Work Plan & Budget for 2012 which was subsequently prepared and endorsed by the Fund Council.

Agenda item 11: Impact Assessment, Report and preparation of activities in the new biennium

Derek Byerlee, Chair of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), gave an overview of the mandate, structure and operational plan of SPIA, and welcomed new SPIA member Bhavani Shankar, and paid tribute to Mywish Maredia, SPIA member for six years, for her outstanding contribution to SPIA's work. Byerlee then gave details of the activities carried out by SPIA since the last meeting. SPIA's Environmental Impact Assessment study has now been completed, and a final report is with the publisher Green Ink for type-setting and printing. The findings will be presented in a series of journal articles, impact briefs and presented at the Science Forum in Beijing and at a conference in Stockholm in November.

The Diffusion and Impact of Improved Varieties in Africa (DIIVA) project (2010 – 2012), a \$3 million project funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, is currently around the half-way point. Progress is more or less on track. More than 100 crop-country combinations are being covered in this study and all seven commodity improvement Centers with crop mandates relevant for Africa are involved. Byerlee presented some initial results, demonstrating fairly significant increases in adoption between 1998 and 2010 for virtually all the major crop-country combinations received so far. These data are from focus groups set up of experts with knowledge of the local agricultural conditions, and are in the process of being validated through a series of nationally representative adoption surveys. Three in-depth impact assessments were funded from January 2011, focusing on beans and sweet potatoes in Rwanda and Uganda (CIAT/CIP); maize and wheat in East Africa (CIMMYT); and pearl millet, sorghum and rice in West Africa (Africa Rice / ICRISAT).

Four new case-studies have recently been funded under the Impacts on Poverty and Undernutrition (2010 – 2013) study, with funding for CGIAR Centers coming from a grant from USAID. Three micro-level studies have been allocated funding following a competitive call for proposals, focusing on: Maize improvement in Malawi and Zambia (CIMMYT); Rice improvement in India, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Philippines (IRRI); and Integrated agriculture-aquaculture in Bangladesh (WorldFish). These case-studies will run until early 2013. In addition, SPIA commissioned IFPRI to lead a country-level impact study in Ethiopia, looking across the contributions of all seven CGIAR centers with a history of work in that country. This is a country-level computable general equilibrium (CGE) model incorporating the relative contributions in isolation, and in combination, of the seven CGIAR centers to agricultural productivity, and modeling productivity effects in the economy.

SPIA launched a cross-cutting "Stripe" Impact Assessment of Legume Research in the CGIAR in January 2011, which will run to December 2012. SPIA has engaged the services of a consultant to lead the project and through a series of visits to relevant centers (ICARDA, ICRISAT India and Nairobi, IITA) have identified two cases for surveys in early 2012, mainly with the objective of establishing accurate adoption estimates, namely: Cowpea improvement in Nigeria (IITA); and Chickpea and Pigeonpea improvement in India (ICRISAT). SPIA will also be contacting CGIAR centers that are planning new studies on other crop-country combinations (e.g Pigeonpea improvement in Tanzania – ICRISAT; Beans in Rwanda and Uganda – CIAT; Chickpea in Turkey and Syria – ICRISAT).

The aim of the Germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation study (GCCCE, 2009-2011) is to measure and value (to the extent possible) impacts from GCCCE-related activities by the CGIAR. SPIA has commissioned a consultant to develop a limited number of cases studies

for economic impact assessment. Preliminary visits to relevant CGIAR centers identified those case studies.

Byerlee outlined early plans for 2012-14 to update the high-level estimates that the CGIAR has relied on since 2003 in the case of overall system-level impacts (the Raitzer and Maredia meta-analysis). Global impacts from crop germplasm improvement featured in the Evenson and Gollin volume. This new effort would be in collaboration with centers and donors, and would provide an interim process that keeps impact assessment moving during a transition phase while CRPs are getting established.

On Communications and Outreach, SPIA is planning a workshop for the impact assessment focal points from each of the Centers, to be held in August 2012 in Iguazu, Brazil, immediately prior to the International Association of Agricultural Economics (IAAE) meetings. SPIA will launch a call for papers later in 2011, with the intention of linking up the meeting with the launch of a special issue of a journal on the topic of advancing impact assessment of agricultural research. Work continues on refining the <http://impact.cgiar.org> website, making it a more useful resource for IA practitioners and donors. New written products from SPIA are in the pipeline that will be on the website in the first instance.

In response to a question about health impacts, Byerlee explained that SPIA is now starting to think about how to tackle nutrition as a focus for ex-post IA and that health would have to wait for the future. SPIA Member, Bhavani Shankar, in particular will lead discussion of this area at the next ISPC Meeting. Byerlee explained SPIA's plans for a proposal to donors to enhance IA in the Centers / CRPs. There will be two tracks for funding. The first will comprise commissioned adoption studies for crop germplasm improvement impacts. The second will consist of a competitive grant process on all other forms of research outputs, will be open to proposals from groups outside the CGIAR, and would encourage a focus on environmental, poverty and nutrition impacts. SPIA was encouraged to advertise the call for proposals widely – on the web, through advertisements in agricultural economics journals, etc.

It was suggested that SPIA might usefully consider the impact of CGIAR research on developed country agriculture – something that was the focus of some studies by IFPRI ten or more years ago. Also, on the environmental impacts, tracing the fate of nitrogen in farming systems provides a useful focus.

SPIA was also encouraged to be less focused on perceived CGIAR success stories, and instead to take the livelihoods of farmers as the starting point for impact assessments, i.e., track changes in communities over time, identifying uptake of technologies (from the CGIAR, from indigenous knowledge, from commercial companies) and look at impacts in a broader context of total change. The need for SPIA to foster capacity for carrying out IA among scientists and economists in developing countries was highlighted. Byerlee responded by explaining that the IFPRI-led SPIA-commissioned study in Ethiopia is an attempt to look at all sources of innovation in a country and work from that through the economy to look at country-wide impacts of technological change – so not just a CGIAR-centric analysis. Capacity for impact assessment, at least within the CGIAR, has picked up in the last few years – where once we had a dearth of capacity in social sciences.

One observer praised SPIA's efforts, explaining how much SPIA's work is appreciated by the donors and the Fund Council. Recent studies are getting much closer to the kind of evidence that donors need. This needs to be presented clearly and succinctly to donors in imaginative ways. A study documenting developed country benefits would be particularly valuable in the current funding climate for international aid.

On the apparent discrepancy between current perceptions of lack of progress in SSA and the recent DIVA results showing widespread adoption of improved cultivars, one ISPC member explained that yield gain was quite variable in SSA. In Nigeria, for example, there has been a 2.2% per year annual rate of gain, whereas in East Africa there has been little yield gain. Byerlee also emphasized that the counterfactual could have been that the yields were going down over time. However, attribution to varieties alone is difficult as fertilizer use per hectare has actually declined over time.

The question of a possible study to estimate the (foregone) impacts of not using genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in the food crops was raised. The Chair explained that this was one of the possible foresight activities relating to CGIAR investments in biotech. and that the ISPC can do a lot of strategic thinking on whether and how GMOs can help improve agricultural productivity. This is a more appropriate avenue of investigating this topic further, rather than through a SPIA study.

The ISPC Chair thanked the SPIA Chair for his clear presentation of these important activities for the CGIAR at large.

Agenda Item 12. Interaction with CIMMYT

CIMMYT research staff and the Director General provided overviews of research aspects of the CIMMYT program and new infrastructure/new development through the Borlaug initiative and planning for CIMMYT HQ. Details of this part of the program are provided in the attachment.

Agenda Item 13: Review of draft ISPC workplan

The ISPC reviewed a draft version of the WorkPlan prepared for the period 2012/13. The discussion built upon earlier agenda items (particularly items 8, 9, 10 and 11) and, inviting input from observers additionally noted the following:

For Program Review it was noted that although CRP monitoring and evaluation was clearly the role of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) once formulated, there was still a considerable job to be done a) on the development side of CRPs – for instance as many CRPs had promised inception phases before a full workplan could be developed, b) cross CRP perspectives on science quality and relevance in relation to how well the system was addressing the SRF, and c) cross CRP perspectives on possible synergies to be gained in addressing the current SRF.

On Strategy and Trends; Scenario projections and trends have proven to be susceptible to macroeconomic forces and so they, and long term aspirations of CRPs may have to remain flexible and research adjusted accordingly. The intent is to help the CGIAR construct plausible scenarios using the outputs of various foresight groups, not to mount foresight exercises per se. The CGIAR has involvement in the Global Futures project, with ASTI etc. so the role of the ISPC is to look particularly at the key scientific issues i.e. choice and prioritisation of research and the research path to the alleviation of the target constraints. Areas where the ISPC may have a particular role to play are in studying the effects of urbanization and in crop yield. It was noted that prioritization of effort in the new CGIAR would include addressing policy research, the research/policy interface and determining the benefits from integrated approaches. It was noted that the Fund Council would doubtless appreciate understanding the rationale for CRP choice, their short term outputs and the scope of likely impacts (an assessment different from the SRF). Honesty will be required in providing concrete decision-making advice to the Funders. Observers felt that the ISPC had a role

in identifying the scientific developments which would make a difference in the next 7-10 years but including the way these developments might intersect with overall data management and partner requirements. The likely impact of groups making public statements on the need to include transgenic research in the CGIAR portfolio was discussed. An up-to-date assessment of CGIAR technology could be useful in this area as biotechnological research in general amounts to substantial investment across the CGIAR. A good broker might also be required in discussions of the selection of sentinel sites and how the data was to be selected, measured and managed. Defining the information and information management requirements for the CGIAR over and above program reporting was an area that needed to be addressed urgently. Conducting a helicopter view of the CRPs may allow some of these several issues to be brought to the surface.

Others suggested that the limitation would not be on access to new technologies but in impact pathway analysis for the CGIAR to have its proposed impacts on poverty. The SPIA Chair noted that the CGIAR should be able to demonstrate impact at the sites they chose to work, but the system (including the ISPC) would have to evaluate the effective scaling up of such impacts. Finally, was the issue for several CRPs (and the development arena in general) of changing mind-sets to enhance the chance of having impact. This takes the science and its evaluators into the realm of incentives and human behavioural sciences, an area where the CGIAR has little current expertise or means of judging impacts.

Sayer noted that the main vehicle used by the ISPC for mobilising science had been the Science Fora. It would be appropriate to align ISPC efforts more directly with the strategic needs for foresight or exploration of specific areas with the global community and bring the strategy and trends and mobilising science areas more closely together. This intent would be reflected in the new WP&B including a Science Forum planned for 2013. It was agreed that increased efforts would be to increase communication (perhaps through new media) of the outputs of the Forum and to run a broad evaluation of the success of the Forum in 2013. For the 2011 event, a summary would be prepared and a set of key papers would be published in an eminent journal. The ISPC would also distil a Brief of the take home messages of the Forum for use by the funder and broader scientific community.

Agenda Item 14: Any other Business

Mywish Maredia was recognised and thanked by the ISPC and SPIA Chairs for her excellent work and contributions as a SPIA panel member over six years as she was now stepping down. She thanked the SPIA Chair and current and former colleagues on the ISPC and Science Council for a rewarding experience.

The ISPC Chair thanked Members and observers for their contribution to what had been a good discussion process in support of the future work of the ISPC. He thanked the CIMMYT DG and his staff for the support in being able to hold the meeting in Mexico. He noted that whilst the Council would be proceeding to develop its WP&B, the process of discussion was not finished and he hoped that Centers would engage with the ISPC in ways to enhance the effectiveness of the CGIAR.

There being no other business the meeting was closed at 13:00.

Meeting Agenda

4th Meeting of the Independent Science Partnership Council 14-16 September 2011

International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)

El Batán, Texcoco, MEXICO

Tel +525 95 9521 900

Monday September 12th

SPIA Meeting

Arrival of ISPC members

Tuesday September 13th

SPIA Meeting

12:00

All ISPC Members and Secretariat to be checked-in at CIMMYT

14:00-17:30

ISPC closed session

19:00

ISPC dinner

Wednesday September 14th

- 08:30** **1. Opening Session**
i. Welcome and opening: Ken Cassman
ii. Welcome from the DG CIMMYT: Tom Lumpkin
- 09:00** **2. Update on the CGIAR**
i. Ken Cassman (ISPC Chair)
ii. Ganesan Balachander (Consortium Board)
iii. Andrew Ward (Consortium Office)
iv. Jonathan Wadsworth (Fund Office)
- 11:00* *Break*
- 11:20** **3. Report on Science Forum**
Jeff Sayer
4. Report on NRM study
Jeff Sayer
- 12:10** **5. CRP 3.6 Dryland cereals**
Lead Center presenter: Dave Hoisington and Óscar Riera Lizarazu
- 13:00* *Special lunch hosted by CIMMYT (Ambassadors Day)*
- 14:30** **6. CRP 3.5 Grain legumes**
Lead Center presenter: Dave Hoisington and CL Gouda
- 15:20** **7. CRP 1.2 Humid Tropics**
Lead Center presenter: Paula Bramel
- 16:10* *Break*
- 16:30** **8. Summary observations on the CRPs**

8a. Relationships between “Systems” CRPs (1.1 etc) and commodity or multicrop CRPs (3.1etc)

8b. Helicopter view of the CRP portfolio (emerging areas, cross cutting areas, missing science, partnerships, governance)
- 18:00** **Close**
- 18:30* *Reception hosted by ISPC at CIMMYT Headquarters*

Thursday September 15th

08:30

9. Setting priorities

9a. Review and recap of CRP portfolio issues (as needed, spillover from session 8)

9b. Processes in support of the SRF

09:15

10. Brainstorming on ISPC role and aspects for foresight

10a. Data to support priority setting—example, HarvestChoice
Stanley Wood (IFPRI) 30 mins

10b. Process and criteria for ISPC activities in foresight

10c. Prospective activities for the ISPC (proposals by ISPC members)

10:40

Break

11:10

11. Impact Assessment, Report and preparation of activities in the new biennium

12:30

Lunch

14:00

12. Interaction with CIMMYT

An opportunity will be provided for the participants to see some of the unique germplasm, breeding lines and agronomy trials in the field, and CIMMYT staff will provide overviews on the four component MasAgro project with Mexico, the SIMLESA project, several strategic initiatives from the CRPs, the Borlaug Institute for South Asia and the reconstruction plans for CIMMYT HQ. Details of this part of the program will be provided nearer the time.

Dinner hosted by Dr Lumpkin (CIMMYT Director General) at his home.

Friday September 16th

08:30	13. Review of draft ISPC workplan
	Identification of new areas:
	Foresight
	Mobilizing Science
<i>10:00-10:30 Break</i>	Program Evaluation (continuing CRP evaluation)
	Impact Assessment
	Support to the Consortium / SRF
	Budget implications
12:30	14. Any other Business
13:00	End of Meeting
<i>13:00-14:30</i>	<i>Working lunch for the ISPC</i>
15:00	ISPC Members free to depart

Annex 2



ISPC overview of CIMMYT 15 Sep 2011

- 12:30 *Lunch at CIMMYT Cafeteria* (Sasakawa room)
- 13:30 Seeds of Discovery (MAIZE SI8 and WHEAT SI9) – Peter Wenzl
- 14:15 Visit CA demo plots & reconstruction plans for HQ Facilities – Bram Govaerts and Tom Lumpkin (Sasakawa room)
- 15:00 CIMMYT systems work, example MasAgro/Take-it-to the farmer (MAIZE SI2 and WHEAT SI2) – Bram Govaerts
- 15:30 Wheat yield consortium (WHEAT SI7) – Matthew Reynolds
- 16:00 New trends in maize genetic improvement (MAIZE SI9) – Sarah Hearne
- 16:30 Overview CIMMYT, BISA, reconstruction plans for HQ Facilities – Tom Lumpkin
- 17:00 Overall discussion
- 18:00 Adjourn

Annex 3

Fourth ISPC Meeting September 2011 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS		
ISPC MEMBERS		
1.	Kenneth G Cassman Chair, Independent Science and Partnership Council of the CGIAR and Heuermann Professor of Agronomy University of Nebraska, Lincoln Tel: +1 402-472-5554 email: kcassman1@unl.edu	
2.	Derek Byerlee, 3938 Georgetown Ct NW Washington DC 20007, USA. Tel: +1 202 492 2544 e-mail: dbyerlee@gmail.com	
3.	Margaret Gill Professor of Integrated Land Use University of Aberdeen 14B/10 Riversdale Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5QT, UK United Kingdom Tel: +44 770 31 31 373 e-mail: m.gill@abdn.ac.uk	
4.	Vibha Dhawan Ph.D Executive Director The Energy & Resources Institute (TERI) Habitat Place, Lodhi Road New Delhi - 110 003 Phone : +91-11-24682100, 41504900 Mobile: +91-98-1100-9262 Fax : +91-11-24682144, 24682145 email: vibhad@teri.res.in	
5.	Jeff Sayer Director, Development Practice Programme School of Earth and Environmental Sciences JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY P.O. Box 6811, Cairns N. Queensland 4870, Australia Tel +61.7.4042 1663 e-mail: jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au	

6.	<p>Marcio de Miranda Santos Executive Director, Center for Strategic Studies and Management of Science, Technology and Innovation www.cgee.org.br Tel: 55 61 34249601/11 Fax: 55 61 34249660 email: mmiranda@cgee.org.br</p>	
7.	<p>Hassan Rashid Centre for Environmental Economics and Policy in Africa CEEPA University of Pretoria PRETORIA 0002 South Africa Tel: (+27 12) 420 3317 e-mail: rashid.hassan@up.ac.za</p>	

OBSERVERS		
1.	<p>Mywish K. Maredia Assoc. Professor, Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics 89 Agriculture Hall, Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824-1039, USA Phone: 517-353-6602; Fax 517-432-1073 Email: maredia@msu.edu Skype id: ishwym</p>	
2.	<p>Bhavani Shankar Professor School of Oriental & African Studies University of London 36 Gordon Square London WG1HOPD UK Tel: +44 11896 12 710 Email: b.shankar@soas.ac.uk</p>	
3.	<p>Stanley Wood Senior Research Fellow & Co-PI HarvestChoice International Food Policy Research Institute 2033 K St. NW Washington D.C. 20006, U.S.A Tel +1 (202) 862 8122 email: s.wood@cgiar.org</p>	
4.	<p>Dr Dave Hoisington Deputy Director General-Research ICRISAT Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh India Tel +91 40 3071 3221 Mobile: +91 98 6608 0951 email: d.hoisington@cgiar.org</p>	
5.	<p>Jennifer "Vern" Long Senior International Agriculture Research Advisor Bureau for Food Security/ARP/Research USAID, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington DC 20004 Tel: 202-712-4887 Email: JLong@usaid.gov</p>	
6.	<p>Jonathan Wadsworth Executive Secretary CGIAR Fund Council c/o World Bank 1818 H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433 USA</p>	

	<p>Tel: 1-202-473-8918 email: jwadsworth@worldbank.org or j.wadsworth@cgiar.org</p>	
7.	<p>Dr. Ir. Maarten van Ginkel Deputy Director General - Research ICARDA P.O. Box 5466 Aleppo Syria Tel +963 21 221 3433 (ICARDA HQ, switchboard) +963 21 2691 2210 (ICARDA HQ, direct line) Mobile (Syria): +963 944 386 151 Mobile roaming: +971 505 584 043 Email: m.vanginkel@cgiar.org</p>	
8.	<p>Elcio Guimaraes Research Area Director Climate Change and Capacity Strengthening, and Latin America and the Caribbean Coordinator 57.2.4450070 CIAT A.A.6713 Cali, Colombia Email: E.Guimaraes@CGIAR.ORG</p>	
9.	<p>C L Laxmipathi Gowda Director, Grain Legumes Program International Crops Research Institute for the Semi- Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) Patancheru 502 324 Andhra Pradesh India Tel: (O) +91-040-30713354 Fax: +91-040-30713074/30713075 E-mail: c.gowda@cgiar.org</p>	
10.	<p>Ganesan Balachander, Ph.D Member of the Consortium Board of the CGIAR B 20, Pushpanjali Farms Bijwasan, New Delhi 110061 India Tel 91-11-2806-2551 Mob 91-98100 60381 Email: gbalachander12@gmail.com</p>	
11.	<p>Stephen Beebe Bean Team Leader, CIAT 57-2-4450000, Ext. 3447 Skype: sebeebe A.A. 67-13, Cali, Colombia Email: S.BEEBE@CGIAR.ORG</p>	

12.	<p>Jean-Marcel Ribaut Director The GENERATION Challenge Program www.generationcp.org c/o CIMMYT, Int APDO Postal 6-641 06600 Mexico DF Mexico Email: j.ribaut@cgiar.org Phone: +52 (55) 5804 2004 ext. 1312</p>	
13.	<p>Paula Bramel IITA DDG-RYD Oyo Road Ibadan Nigeria Email: P.BRAMEL@CGIAR.ORG</p>	
14.	<p>Óscar Riera-Lizarazu Director Dryland Cereals Research Program ICRISAT Patancheru 502 324 Andhra Pradesh India Tel: +91 403071 3366 Mobile: +91 96 1818 1921 Email: O.Riera-Lizarazu@cgiar.org</p>	

ISPC SECRETARIAT		
1.	<p>Peter Gardiner Executive Director CGIAR ISPC Secretariat FAO, OEKD, C628 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy Tel +39 06 570 52 458 e-mail: Peter.Gardiner@fao.org</p>	
2.	<p>Sirkka Immonen Senior Agricultural Research Officer CGIAR ISPC Secretariat FAO, OEKD, C634 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy Tel +39 06 57054861 e-mail: Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org</p>	
3.	<p>Timothy Kelley Senior Agricultural Research Officer CGIAR ISPC Secretariat FAO, OEKD, C632 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy Tel +39 06 57054210 e-mail: Timothy.Kelley@fao.org</p>	
4.	<p>Serena Fortuna Consultant –Natural Resources Management CGIAR ISPC Secretariat FAO, OEKD, C631, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy Tel. +39 06 570 56091 Email: Serena.Fortuna@fao.org</p>	
5.	<p>M^a Victoria Alemany Martín Meeting coordinator CGIAR ISPC Secretariat FAO, OEKD, C630, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy Tel. +39 06 570 53645 Email: Victoria.Alemany@fao.org</p>	