Independent Science and Partnership Council

CGIAR

28 February 2013

ISPC Commentary on the revised proposal *Integrated agricultural production systems for improved food security and livelihoods in dry areas* (CRP1.1 Drylands Systems Program) (*Version of 28 January 2013*).

This Commentary relates to the revised CRP 1.1 Dryland Systems proposal submitted for consideration of the Fund Council in January 2013 after an "inception period" and completion of the recommended period of consultation by program proponents with regional partners.

The main objective of CRP 1.1 Dryland Systems is to achieve sustainable agricultural development in the drylands. On the technical level, it will aim at reducing demand for water per unit crop area, improving water capture and storage, increasing productivity per unit of water at farm and landscape levels, and changing land-use practices to better manage risk and sustainably enhance production and income. On the social level, it will enhance the capacity of communities, including marginalized sectors, to address constraints and respond to economic opportunities. At the institutional level, it will strengthen policies that empower small-scale farmers, provide them with better access to markets, and reduce their vulnerability.

The major goals of the Dryland Systems program are to improve the lives of 87 million people in dryland areas of the world, and to mitigate land degradation in over 1 million square kilometres of drylands by sustainably increasing productivity by 10–20% in the most marginal and vulnerable dryland systems and by 20–30% in systems with the potential for intensification, while simultaneously increasing technology adoption rates through the use of partnerships involving innovation platforms—coalitions of actors (mostly informal), that promote and identify the knowledge needs of target groups and test various options to address these needs.

Conceptually, the program has divided dryland production systems into two broad categories: marginal areas with the deepest endemic poverty and most vulnerable people, which are often faced with severe natural-resource degradation, pronounced climate variability, and social inequity; and those in less marginal agro-ecosystems, which have the potential to make positive impacts on food security and poverty in the short to medium term. These categories are a somewhat arbitrary distinction and while admittedly simplifying the inherent complexities within dryland systems, the program needs to consider also the interactions between them. The distinction by agro-ecosystem underlies the two basic but complementary approaches to improving dryland systems: (i) Reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience to biophysical and socioeconomic shocks despite marginal conditions, to be approached in Strategic Research Theme 2 (or SRT2); and (ii) Sustainable intensification of somewhat better-endowed production systems to reduce food insecurity and generate more income (SRT3). These major themes are complemented in a systems approach by two further themes, namely, SRT1: Approaches to

strengthening innovation systems, building stakeholder innovation capacity, and linking knowledge to policy action, and SRT4: Anticipating and measuring impacts and cross-regional synthesis.

The ISPC considers this version of the proposal a very significant improvement on the version reviewed by the ISPC in November 2011[1]. Engagement with stakeholders has been extensive and plans for continuing engagement are convincing. Advances have been made in developing the parameters for site selection. The four Strategic Research Themes (SRTs) are logical and recognition of heterogeneity within the dry areas driving SRTs 2 and 3 as 'Reducing vulnerability and managing risk' and 'Sustainable intensification.....' provides a good framework for identifying action sites. However, the proponents and research managers need to be aware of the possibility that synergies can occur and that the better-endowed systems can be a stabiliser and strengthen surrounding agriculture in less favourable systems. Further, the ISPC draws attention to the challenges inherent in delivering the proposed objectives and outputs of SRT2. Particularly output 2.2 "scaling up and out" on page 40. Improved resilience and reduced vulnerability in any system do not occur quickly and require a long-term process of engagement. Improvements may be difficult to measure during the lifetime of the program. Interventions to influence such system attributes need long time frames to observe and evaluate outcomes and impacts before scaling up and out. The difficulty with defining indicators for monitoring outcomes and impacts in this respect is apparent (p29).

Descriptions of the cross-cutting themes were more variable in the proposal. For instance, gender and youth receive considerable attention and gave confidence that the issues would be addressed. Issues in relation to biodiversity are less-secure in their scientific underpinnings. Nutrition is barely discussed and the proposal therefore remains unconvincing in its stated efforts towards this goal. Paragraph 5.4.4 was particularly disappointing.

Effort has been placed in identifying locations for the proposed research through more attention to the development of research hypotheses. The hypotheses in general add value, although some were overly generic i.e. relevant to systems research rather than specific to dryland systems. Recognition of the potential for the systems programs to develop research methodology together was welcomed. Progress towards a performance management system is described but is not considered to be complete (see discussion of the Must Haves). Much has been written, as requested, on delivery and theories of change, but it tends to leave the proposal now reflecting an emphasis on process rather than on what could be delivered. The proponents still need to build on the good start made through the inception meetings and define what the CRP itself, and what other CRPs and external partners, will bring to the science which will enable the program to deliver. While it is good to see the new CRP building on past ICARDA research, the emphasis on this in Annex 3 (as it was not combined with other contributing Centers) did not give confidence that the reform process had indeed been sufficiently embraced. The ISPC appreciates the effort that had obviously been put into identifying and sketching opportunities for linkages with other CRPs, but there is still much work to be done to convince readers that the flow of knowledge from the commodity programs to this CRP will be effective in terms of uptake/adoption. The ISPC accepts that the systems programs have an additional role in

[1] In February 2012, the ISPC also reviewed an additional strategic research theme 5 suggested by the proponents on biodiversity which was not found satisfactory and was subsequently rejected by the Fund Council.

understanding how agricultural research can be brought to have impact on the SLOs in target regions and that innovation platforms can be facilitators and research incubators of these efforts. However, the ISPC believes planning and defining the balance of work that commodity and systems programs will conduct in the future is a remaining issue for the CGIAR as a whole.

Management arrangements are described, but there are still elements where more clarity is needed. For instance, the critique of Must Have 4 notes that, three of the five areas were well covered in the inception phase but that two require more work. Management from the apex of the program to the regions is made clear, but the relationships which will ensure synthesis and quality across the program (regions, SRTs 1 and 2 and the cross cutting themes), also need attention. The ISPC is convinced that the emphasis on having a 'world-leading scientist' as Director is correct (and encourage this approach across the CRPs), but there seems to be a high degree of administrative/management tasks in the job description. Care needs to be taken to ensure that the Director has sufficient time to direct and monitor quality of the science. It was not entirely clear as to how the quality of individual research projects would be ensured. Similarly, the Scientific Advisory Committee looks like a less-powerful addition (than it is for example in CRP 7 where it provides significant added value). It also is not clear how the Independent Scientific Advisors (ISAs) would go about their tasks. Is it anticipated that they would focus on specific areas of the research or always work as a team? The Regional Stakeholder Advisory Committees illustrate a strong commitment to user involvement, though it was not clear how large these would be and how the expectations of appointed members would be managed.

In summary, **the ISPC recommends that the proposal be approved.** The current revised proposal is considerably improved over former submissions when considered together with the regional inception reports. The ISPC is encouraged by the stakeholder interactions and urges that the strategic direction set by the proposal is crystallised around a relevant body of research, some of which will inevitably be founded within existing Center research but which will also require pipeline technologies (some produced by other CRPs) and a sophisticated research for development lens and analysis requiring potentially an enhanced partner mix.

Having recommended approval, however, the ISPC notes that not all Must Haves have been met. Thus the ISPC recommends that CRP 1.1 proponents develop a more polished proposal to guide program development and more adequately capture the important information contained in the site reports. Much of this can be achieved through strategic annexes. If this is done then Must Haves 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 & 11 will be met. The ISPC would like to encourage more attention to Must Haves 6, 7, 9, and particularly 12 & 13 as the program develops. Further, overall framing of the program is needed to address cross-cutting contexts - which the proposal says are being addressed - and for an adequate performance management structure to deliver on major and cross-cutting goals. Earlier advice of the ISPC in relation to the role of CRP 1.2 is again relevant here, namely, "if the system CRPs are viewed to be essential components of the new CGIAR portfolio to serve as crucibles of integration of different outputs from more up-stream research, then we note there are fundamental differences between system CRPs and commodity/topical focus CRPs, and that the former have a greater challenge in articulating a specific work plan. Thus we recognize a need for a different model of continual review, monitoring, and evaluation for the system 1 series CRPs."

The following commentary provides further discussion of the adequacy of the proposal and suggested actions in relation to the Must Haves (see below).

Review of the extent to which proponents have addressed the ISPC "*must-haves*"

Must Have 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 "reduced vulnerability" focus of SRT2, or the "sustainable intensification" focus of SRT3.*

Although sections 1.1, 2.2 & 6 of the revised proposal provide a very summarised input about characterization of the target dryland systems, the characterizations in the Inception Phase site reports provides a large amount of detail on biophysical and socio-economic details of the target regions and action sites: climate, soil, land use, land degradation, water resources, farming systems, poverty, market linkages, and institutional support etc. The only exception is the action sites in Pakistan where some information was not available. In its response to this "Must Have", the proponents have explained the use of both the Aridity Index (its value and its deficiencies) as well as other criteria that take better account of risk and severity of water shortage. Although more effort is needed in Pakistan, the datasets amassed during the Inception Phase are sufficient to adequately categorize regions and action sites that fall into the two main foci of SRT2 and SRT3. However, it will not be an easy task to prioritize the key criteria that will allow CRP 1.1 *to best measure its progress against its over-arching goals*: to improve the lives of 87 million people in dryland areas of the world, and to mitigate land degradation in over 1 million square kilometres of drylands by sustainably increasing productivity by 10–20% in the most marginal and vulnerable dryland systems and by 20–30% in systems with the potential for intensification.

Must Have 1 has been addressed providing the Target region and Action Site Reports are annexed to the proposal for CRP 1.1.

Must Have 2: *Establish clear set of hypotheses as an organizing principle to help prioritize the research and results agenda.*

The proposal provides evidence that a great deal of effort has been put into establishing a set of hypotheses both as organising principles (at the generic level) and as a means to prioritize the research and results agendas (at the target region and action site levels). The revised proposal deals well with generating two levels of hypotheses within the framework of the four SRTs (see Sections 3 & 5 of proposal). Specific hypotheses that prioritise the research and results agenda were generated in each target region/action site during the Inception Phase. In order to help direct both the implementing team and future reviewers, it is recommended that the logframes for the regions and summaries in the main Inception Phase report are included as an Annex in the revised proposal.

It is also noted that there is some overlap in the 16 hypotheses common to all target regions as listed in the main Inception Phase report and the CRP response to the "Must Haves". For example:

"Integrated soil and water management enhances agricultural productivity" and *"Effective soil and water management can enhance intensification, reduce risk and increase land productivity"* could be combined into one hypothesis.

In addition, *"Adopting appropriate integrated, systems-based technologies, institutions and policies will reduce vulnerability and improve livelihoods in dryland production systems"* and *"Adopting appropriate technologies, institutions policies options will reduce vulnerability and improve livelihoods in dryland production systems"* are essentially the same hypothesis.

Furthermore, there are no activities, outputs or outcomes in the proposal in any target region/action site to support the hypothesis that *"Increased agro-biodiversity can increase plant productivity to mitigate food shortages and increase overall system productivity, profitability and resilience".* This is not a common hypothesis and would be very difficult to challenge following a scientific process.

Must Have 2 will be met if the specific hypotheses that prioritise the research and results agenda that were generated in each target region/action site during the Inception Phase are annexed to the proposal.

Must Have 3: *Provide the criteria for choice of benchmark sites and development of relevant data to inform research requirements in both the biophysical and social sciences, and their synthesis.*

Various levels of criteria were used to select Target Regions and Action Sites. These are described in various sections of the revised proposal (e.g. Sections 2.2 [Table 2] and 6 [Tables 4 & 5]) as well as in the Inception Phase site reports. The main criteria for selection of Action Sites include: Accessibility; Potential for hypothesis testing; Representativeness; Potential for impact; Potential to attract funds; Potential to interact with other CRPs; and Availability of existing environmental, biophysical and socio-economic data. A *de facto* criterion seems also to have been: *Potential to expand existing partnerships* and *Past history of successful project implementation* – at least in some of the sites. Where such criteria are satisfied, the ability to develop data to inform biophysical and social sciences research and their synthesis has a high chance of success.

Must Have 3 is fairly well-addressed in the revised proposal and complemented by the Inception Phase site reports.

Must Have 4: *Refine site selection and characterization and prioritize activities to be carried out, working from impacts to activities.*

The major activities during the Inception Phase of CRP 1.1 were focussed on addressing this "Must Have" through the regional workshops and consultations. These included: Revisit and finalize target areas, and the associated action and satellite sites, where the majority of the research will be implemented; Characterize sites for their agro-ecosystems and livelihoods; Identify major problems and constraints to production and livelihoods; Form hypotheses and research questions for action sites; Identify and prioritize research-for-development interventions

to address these hypotheses and questions; Develop detailed work plans, including specific research activities, approaches, and methods, partnerships, and stakeholders; and Discuss and agree on the elements for the logframe (hypotheses, activities, outputs & outcomes). The process was participatory and consultative as evidenced from the site groundwork reports. Although the quality and extent of the outputs from these workshops varies from region to region, most have adequately addressed the basic requirements for site selection and characterization as well as prioritizing activities through a process from outcomes/impacts to activities. This was especially well-addressed in the North Africa & West Asia, the Central Asia & Caucasus as well as the West Africa & Dry Sahel Inception Phase Reports. However it was only partly addressed in other regions where more work is still needed.

Must Have 4 is fairly well-addressed in the revised proposal and complemented by the Inception Phase site reports for three regions but more effort is needed for the South Asia and East & Southern Africa regions.

Must Have 5: *Provide more detail on the underpinning science and agronomic, genetic, and farming system approaches to be evaluated once the first phase has progressed.*

The Inception Phase reports have made progress in identifying and recording more of the specific scientific underpinnings and approaches required by this "Must Have", but the description within the proposal (section5) remains at a conceptual level. The recommendation, therefore is to include an Annex in the revised proposal that provides a comprehensive account of the underpinning science and agronomic, genetic and farming system approaches to achieve the goals of the proposal.

The sections on agrobiodiversity and its potential role in contributing to the proposal goals are especially deficient in identifying underpinning science to contribute to increased productivity. If the local genetic resources in drylands are key to improving productivity due to their evolution under harsh conditions then why has this not yet been achieved? In addition, surely the best way to use these valuable traits is to breed them into more productive dryland crops? One of the key successes in the West African Sahel has been introduced non-indigenous vegetables for household nutrition and cash income e.g. onions, tomatoes, green vegetables. The case for local agrobiodiversity providing an automatic contribution to improved household nutrition and cash income is not clear.

If the main aim of the proposed work described in the sections on agrobiodiversity is to conserve biodiversity that is threatened by land degradation and pressure on natural habitats with additional benefits to farmers, then this case must not be confused with *increasing plant productivity to mitigate food shortages and increasing overall system productivity, profitability and resilience* as stated in the hypothesis discussed above. And, if there are appropriate incentives available to farmers and other users to conserve biodiversity then the proposal should be revised to reflect this. In addition, the underpinning science that will enable farmer-level interventions to enhance local biodiversity conservation, watershed preservation and climate-change mitigation through carbon sequestration needs to be included. The conflicts that farmers will face when choosing between opportunities for increasing productivity, food security,

nutrition and cash income from introduced agrobiodiversity and incentives to enhance local biodiversity conservation, watershed preservation and climate-change mitigation through carbon sequestration also need to be made clear in the proposal.

Must Have 5 has been partially met through the information on underpinning science and approaches detailed in the target region/action site reports. The ISPC recommends, however, the inclusion of this information in an Annex to the proposal, with revision to take account of the comments above.

Must Have 6: *Provide a more comprehensive theory of how social change will result from the livelihood, gender and innovation systems approaches espoused in the current proposal.*

Section 4 of the revised proposal is a comprehensive and scholarly account of how social change in drylands could result from the impact of the approaches and innovations outlined. It is very strong on the background theory of social change based on livelihoods and vulnerability analysis but also successfully relates this to a clear awareness of potential scenarios that are likely to occur through the implementation of the proposal activities. By identifying different potential scenarios, implementation should develop appropriate mechanisms for both effective research partnerships, effective development and policy partnerships and enhanced partnerships between research, development actors and policy makers. Innovation platforms will form the main means of implementing the process of engagement between the various stakeholders. Such platforms have had mixed success in the SSA-CP but if lessons are learnt from these attempts, there is greater probability of success in CRP 1.1.

The section on the theory of social change is linked to an account of potential impact pathways which provides a conceptual framework for how outputs will achieve outcomes and impacts. There is also a consideration of how various stakeholders will relate to the impact pathway structured around the four SRTs. This helps to determine the type of stakeholder, partner, and entry point to the impact pathway. The section concludes with a restatement of the overall goals of CRP 1.1. Some examples of potential scenarios drawn from the experience of the CGIAR Centers involved and/or the SSA-CP would help to make this important section more convincing.

The lack of intermediate development outcomes (IDOs) and complete lack of quantification of outputs and outcomes not only in the proposal but also in the Inception Phase Summary Report and Inception Phase target region and action site reports does not help to make a convincing case. The reality of CRP 1.1 is that almost 50% of the budget ($62.4 million) is from already active/approved projects funded from Window 3 or bilateral funds. Such projects will have agreed milestones and more importantly, agreed quantified outputs and outcomes. It is not good enough to say that the development of IDOs is an on-going process and at some later stage these will be quantified. Some attempt needs to be made by CRP 1.1 proponents to make Section 4 more convincing especially to show that the impact being claimed can be delivered.

Must Have 6 is partly met. The theory of social change and its links to the impact pathway is well-conceived and presented. The case needs to be made more convincing through more effort on defining intermediate development outcomes and quantification of outputs and outcomes

Must Have 7: *Discuss current research priorities and how they would inform and complement new initiatives*

Annex 3 of the drylands proposal provides a comprehensive list of how current ICARDA research priorities will inform and complement new initiatives. The listing does not provide a review of lessons learnt from successes and failures and how these will inform new initiatives. There also does not appear to be an analysis of the gaps in the CGIAR expertise and how these will be addressed through new partnerships e.g. with development agencies. This important "Must Have" also does not appear to have been seriously addressed in the Inception Phase Summary Report or in the Inception Phase Target Region/Action Site Reports with the exception of the North Africa & West Asia Report which looks at lessons learnt from successes and failures.

Must Have 7 has not been fully met. Information is lacking for most CGIAR partners and for four of the five regions. This Annex should be complemented with a list of how current research priorities from the other major CGIAR partners especially ICRISAT, ILRI & CIP will inform and complement new initiatives. The other regions also need to learn from the good practice in the North Africa and West Asia report in this respect.

Must Have 8: *Identify clearly the research interventions proposed as a result of the diagnosis of the problems.*

The assessments of "Must Haves 4 & 5" above have also addressed "Must Have 8". Each of the Inception Phase Target Region Workshops was asked to provide the following deliverables for their respective target regions: description of constraints and problems; hypotheses and major research questions; outputs, outcomes, and activities; partners and impact pathway and logframe. Workshops posed the problems, developed the hypotheses; then identified the activities needed to address the problems. Research interventions have been developed, in consultation with stakeholders and were detailed in the logframes presented in the five Inception Phase target Region Reports.

Although the quality and extent of the outputs from these workshops varies from region to region, most have adequately addressed the basic requirements for identifying research interventions based on a diagnosis of problems. This was especially well-done in the North Africa & West Asia, the Central Asia & Caucasus as well as the West Africa & Dry Sahel Inception Phase Reports. However it was only partly addressed in other regions where more effort will be needed.

Must Have 8 has been met through some of the Inception Phase Reports although more effort is needed in South Asia and East & Southern Africa. Also this information is not sufficiently reflected in the proposal. An Annex is needed to supplement the proposal.

Must Have 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.*

Section 9 and Tables 6, 7 & 8 provide a list of Center and external partners who will be involved in the Drylands proposal, together with an analysis of the types of interventions or research activities in which they will be involved. Annex 4 provides a detailed list of all non-CGIAR partners (mostly NARES) and provides information on their proposed contributions. A framework for selecting partners or a justification for selecting certain partners for certain tasks other than perhaps past involvement in the assigned activities is not apparent however. Tables 6 & 7 give insight into how the assigned activities will contribute to an integrated agro-ecosystem research agenda. That said, the Inception Phase Summary Report's presentation of partnerships is very inconsistent and not comparable across target regions – in some cases, only CGIAR partnerships are given; other cases of all non-CGIAR partners are listed; there are examples where both are included; while for South Asia the narrative is very vague. The Inception Phase Target Region Reports provide more detail but do not analyse why certain partners are selected versus other options. The justification for this is that the strategic partners best placed to deliver the various SRT outputs can only be identified when the Drylands CRP interdisciplinary regional teams are staffed with stakeholder representatives and become fully operational. However, this is only partly true. Almost 50% of the drylands CRP budget ($62.4 million) is from already active/approved projects funded from Window 3 or bilateral funds. Such projects will have detailed information about partners and their contributions.

Must Have 9 has not been met by either the proposal or by the Inception Phase Reports. The ISPC recommends that further work is undertaken to document partners in the current research which is continuing within the CRP, alongside a description of what is expected of them. This should provide the basis for a strategy for the establishment of new partnerships which should also be added to the proposal to enable all team members and future reviewers to understand what is intended.

Must Have 10: *Differentiate the roles of the crop/commodity CRPs and this system CRP.*

Section 9.2 and Table 7 describe how CRP 1.1 will work with other CRPs. There is useful input on how CRP 1.1 will interact with the crop/commodity CRPs. Annex 1 gives more detail on the working relationships between CRP 5 and Drylands CRP, while Annex 2 outlines this for CRP 7. Although the concern of overlap with CRP 5 is not specifically discussed, the respective activities are outlined in detail and there is good evidence of dialogue between the two groups which should reduce overlap. As CRP 5 has been active for at least a year while CRP 1.1 is not yet fully active, there may be issues that arise when this CRP initiates activities in some of the common sites. The proposed CRP leaders group should facilitate inter-CRP communication and co-ordination in common sites; however, how this will be monitored is not clear. In an ideal world, rational site selection at the beginning of the CGIAR change process could have resolved such problems. The current situation could lead to significant transaction costs – again, how this will be monitored and managed is not clear.

Must Have 10 has been adequately met in the proposal.

Must Have 11: *Integrate available lessons from the SSA-CP*

The ISPC highlighted the need to build on the lessons learnt from the SSA-CP on the validity and merits of the IAR4D approach. The proponents of CRP 1.1 are aware of the outcomes from the Lynam et al. (2010) review of the SSA-CP and have had recent discussions with John Lynam and FARA on this issue. Furthermore, John Lynam will be a member of the CRP 1.1 Independent Advisory Council while FARA is likely to be a member of the Steering Committee. This should provide significant opportunities for CRP 1.1 to benefit from the lessons learnt from the SSA-CP. In addition, two of CRP 1.1 partners – CIRAD and ACIAR have useful experience in innovation systems approaches.

Must Have 11 is likely to be met by the links made between CRP 1.1 and key players involved with the SSA-CP.

Must Have 12: *Develop a logframe and articulate pathways to explicitly link a cluster of outputs to outcomes and impacts and to the SRF system level outcomes*

The proposal still does not include a logframe. Logframes were developed during the Inception Phase for each target region however their quality varies considerably from region to region. Some are fairly complete e.g. North Africa & West Asia; Central Asia & the Caucasus and West Africa & Dry Sahel but others are fragmentary, lacking hypotheses, activities and OVIs. None of the deliverables are quantified. CRP 1.1 appears to be far from developing a proposal-level logframe.

Must Have 12 has not been met. The ISPC recognise that there is work in progress to articulate better the links between CRPs and the Systems level objectives. This is an iterative process and it is recommended that the program documentation is updated as those links become clearer.

Must Have 13: *Include a performance management framework*

Section 7 does not provide a performance management framework. And, as there is no standardised logframe for the drylands CRP, there is no basis for the performance management framework. The framework is currently under development with the Statistical Services Centre at the University of Reading and will be implemented as one of the first activities during the implementation phase.
Must Have 13 has not yet been met. It is accepted that this remains work in progress and the ISPC assume that achievement of this will be monitored by the Consortium Board.

Must have 14: *Build climate variability resilience and sustainable dryland systems through an integrated program combining indigenous knowledge with improved technologies, information dissemination and engagement with stakeholders.*

The ISPC agreed that this requirement had been met on 5th September 2012.

Must Have 15: *Redefine management structure to ensure that the Steering Committee and the Research Management Committee are not both chaired by the DG for the lead centre to avoid potential conflict of interest.*

The ISPC agreed that this requirement had been met on 5th September 2012.

It should be noted, however, that unlike the other CRPs, the lead Centre Board appears to have no role at all in the oversight of this CRP. If the ICARDA Board retains a role of providing oversight on the technical and financial management of ICARDA's activities then it must have the same role over CRP 1.1. This (together with the reporting mechanism) should be reflected in the narrative.

Must Have 16: *Broaden the focus of the proposal to include Latin America and South Asia*

The ISPC supported the geographical focus of the CRP 1.1 on 5th September 2012.

Overall recommendation:

It is recommended that the CRP 1.1 proponents develop a more polished proposal to guide program development. This should adequately capture the important information in the site reports. Much of this can be achieved through strategic annexes. If this is done then Must Haves 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 & 11 will be met. The ISPC would like to encourage more attention to Must Haves 6, 7, 9, and particularly 12 & 13 as the program develops.