

## 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

14 - 16 September 2015  
FAO, Rome

### End of Meeting Report (ISPC Secretariat, 26 October 2015)

#### Agenda Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

Professor Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, welcomed participants and observers to the meeting. She thanked FAO for hosting the meeting, and noted that the CGIAR and FAO have a long and productive history of cooperation stretching back to the formation of the CGIAR in 1971. FAO has hosted the Independent Science and Partnership Council, and its predecessors the Science Council and the Technical Advisory Committee, since 1972.

Ms Maria Helena Semedo, FAO Deputy Director-General, and Coordinator for Natural Resources, welcomed participants and observers on behalf of the FAO Director-General. She emphasized that the activities of the CGIAR and FAO are interlinked and aligned towards the achievement of the SDGs. The cooperation between FAO and the CGIAR is enshrined in a Memorandum of Understanding between the two organizations. Ms Semedo wished the ISPC a productive and successful meeting.

All participants and observers were then given an opportunity to introduce themselves.

#### Agenda Item 2. Reports of CGIAR System Units

##### *i. ISPC*

*Maggie Gill* opened the session with an [update on the current activities of the ISPC and major events](#) since the last meeting (Bogor, March 2015). She reported on the main responsibilities of the ISPC, following the Fund Council (FC) meeting in Bogor in April 2015. This included brief updates on the following six topics: progress of the ISPC Task Force (TF), the CGIAR qualitative prioritization exercise, CRP-II pre-proposal review, Science Fora 2016, Strategy and Trends, SPIA and the ISPC Council and Secretariat changes and recruitment processes.

On the ISPC Council and Secretariat changes, Gill reported that Peter Gardiner left on 31 July due to FAO's retirement rules. While the recruitment process for the new Executive Director is underway, Tim Kelley is the Officer-in-Charge and Paul Harding has been hired as senior consultant to assist the secretariat on a range of issues. Gill informed the meeting that three

ISPC Council members are expected to leave in 2015 – Jeff Sayer and Takuji Sasaki at end of September, and Marcio de Miranda Santos at the end of December. An independent Selection and Nomination Committee (SNC) interviewed and nominated two new Council members at the end August. These are attending the present meeting as observers since their nominations are still to be endorsed by the FC. She also reported that the ISPC will be advertising in November for two more Council members, once the FC has formally commented on the recommendations of the Task Force.

Regarding the Task Force on strengthening the ISPC, Gill noted that the TF was set up on the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the CGIAR system, and endorsed by the Governance Options team. The composition of the TF was: Brian Keating (CSIRO), Hans-Joerg Lutzeyer (EC), Nora Lapitan (USAID), Yusuf Abubakar (FC), Marion Guillou (CB), Wayne Powell (CO), Sirkka Immonen (IEA), Rodney Cook (Board Chair Representative), Vish Nene (Center Representative); Peter Gardiner (Secretary), Maggie Gill (Chair). The TF has held three virtual meetings and reviewed experience from within and outside CGIAR. The TF report was circulated to participants for discussion later in this meeting (*Agenda item 4*).

On prioritization, Gill noted that FC12 (Brussels, 2014) had requested the ISPC to consider qualitative prioritization, and this was confirmed again during FC13 (Bogor, 2015). However, she explained that the start of the exercise had been delayed until the SRF had been finalized. A multi-method approach had been utilized, combining a donor survey on prioritizing at sub-IDO level, and expert opinions against a range of criteria. She announced that the results will be discussed subsequently in the open meeting (*Agenda item 5*).

With reference to the CRP-II pre-proposal reviews, Gill reported that 13 CRP pre-proposals and 9 expressions of interest (EoIs) for 4 coordinating platforms were received by the ISPC on 17 August. These were reviewed by external reviewers, Council members and Secretariat staff. The draft commentaries on each had been prepared, and an ISPC closed meeting (17-19 September) will finalise the commentaries and score each CRP and Flagship. The final commentaries will be submitted by the ISPC Chair to the Fund Office on 28 September. This will be followed by a meeting, hosted by the ISPC in Paris on 29 September, with the Consortium, DGs and donors to discuss the portfolio and to enable the Consortium to make proposals to the FC on how to address any issues and gaps that may be identified.

Gill reported that selected papers from Science Forum SF13 on Nutrition and Health Outcomes had been published in a special section of the journal *Food Security* (June, 2015). She also announced that SF16 is planned for 12-14 April 2016 in Addis Ababa, and will be co-hosted by UNECA, with a financial contribution expected from IFAD. On Strategy and Trends, Gill noted that updates on the studies on Development Corridors and on Partnership will be discussed subsequently in the open meeting (*Agenda items 6 and 7*). The SPIA report will also be presented and discussed (*Agenda item 8*).

## *ii. Consortium Office*

Wayne Powell, Chief Scientific Officer of the Consortium Office, presented an [update from the Consortium](#) focusing on the new CRP Portfolio (2017-2022) and the second call for pre-proposals.

On the portfolio, Powell remarked that the pre-proposals made by the thirteen CRPs (8 commodity-based agri-food systems (AFS) CRPs, 4 globally integrating programs (GI) CRPs and a pre-proposal on Genebanks) had a collective budget request totalling \$8.6 billion,

representing about \$1.5 billion/year. The pre-proposals include large flagship projects with an average budget request exceeding \$100 million, which is larger than that recommended in the guidelines for CRP-II pre-proposals. The average CRP budget request is around \$700 million, with the largest being Agriculture for Nutrition and Health, and the smallest Water, Land and Ecosystems, and the Fish CRPs.

*Powell* presented the budget distribution between W1/2 and bilateral funding, and the breakdown of investments by SLO with comparison between AFS and GI CRPs. Regarding the allocation of W1/2 funding, he suggested the following four general principles: i) the CGIAR should be more disciplined and strategic in resource allocation, stressing the need to address fewer problems so that programs have clear strategic focus, research concentration and critical mass to ensure greater impact; ii) CGIAR needs to provide sustained global capability in key areas of endeavor where it has a comparative advantage; making a commitment to improved strategic co-ordination and integration, creating regional multi-user facilities at country level and making greater use of shared facilities and equipment; iii) CGIAR must use W1 and W2 funding to leverage substantial ‘uplift’ objectives, by focusing on medium to long term (5 years) mission driven research, with strong alignment to the priorities of donors/investors; iv) CGIAR should be bolder in risk-taking, by recognizing the need to stimulate innovation and the potential for ‘step changes’.

*Powell* discussed the CGIAR research pipeline approach toward impact, and asked where the CGIAR should position itself and its science and the development partnerships along the continuum from discovery, proof of concept, pilot phase, and scaling up. Considering the demands and requirements of International Public Breeding Systems, he asked whether the CGIAR has got it right. There is currently a need for an annual rate of genetic gain of 1.5-2.0% for CGIAR crops in farmers’ fields under different agro-ecologies; and for public goods and products that deliver improved productivity, resilience and nutritional enhancement. He noted that these targets are massive and will not be delivered by ‘business as usual’. It requires modernization of the breeding programs together with strong intellectual leadership and management. It may also require centralization of key facilities, infrastructure and information systems, engagement of the private sector, connection and targeted use of genetic diversity, strong relationship to the GI CRPs, particularly nutrition and climate change adaptation, and overall better integration of the CRP portfolio.

Discussing the opportunities and needs for genomics research in the CGIAR, *Powell* quoted the ISPC strategic study on Biotechnology (2014) that “*The new CGIAR is seeking system level improvements in efficiency and there are many opportunities to organize its work more systematically to target efforts on key outcomes and to work in partnership with NARS and ARIs around its core strengths in research, germplasm, phenotyping and adapted varieties for developing countries and of direct benefit to the poor*”. For the AFS CRPs, *Powell* noted that it is important to look at where private sector is in terms of innovation and technology development. He elaborated on the convergence of global diets and the need for diet diversity, and questioned where and how the CGIAR should position itself for exploring the relationship between production and consumption diversities. He then discussed the genome revolution and the implications of sequenced plant genomes on CGIAR’s future research. He highlighted the importance of managing and sustaining crop germplasm collections, and mentioned the new CIAT Agrobiodiversity Facility, as an iconic platform for global food security, germplasm conservation, genetic information, training, and engagement. Finally, he closed by discussing the global importance of youth and gender in the context of CGIAR research.

### *iii. Fund Office*

*Jonathan Wadsworth*, Executive Director of the Fund Office, presented an [update on the status of the CGIAR Fund](#), and discussed various topics and activities relevant to the Fund Council and the FO.

On the status of the CGIAR Fund, *Wadsworth* reported that the total fund inflow, as of 31 August 2015, is about \$598 million. He explained that a funding reduction is expected in 2015, due to the strengthening of US dollar against major donor currencies and to some reduction in volume from a few donors experiencing budget cuts across government. He also noted that the W1/2 projection is \$240 million, which is 7% down from the beginning of the year. Regarding the 2016 fund outlook, he reported that most donors' multi-annual commitments will end and the FO is in the process of requesting renewal of funding commitments. Some donors who experienced funding cuts this year are planning to rebound from the 2015 level in 2016, while others are expected to shift their contribution from W1 to W2. Hence the W1/W2 projection for 2016 is expected to further decrease to about \$210 million.

*Wadsworth* discussed CGIAR resource mobilization (RM) and partnerships, in the context of the FC11 recommendation to conduct a study on RM strategy development in parallel to the development of the new SRF, leading to a new RM plan and estimates of financing for the CRP-II call. RM initiatives include the re-establishment of the RM Community of Practice, innovative financing instruments (Returnable Capital Funds and Product Development Partnerships), and the development of a RM Plan with renewed emphasis on multiannual pledging. The next steps for the development of the RM Strategy, for presenting at FC14, focus on the case for support, including Value for Money analysis (plus Innovative Financing and non-CRP products), identification of political and financial anchors, a calendar of ongoing RM-related events, and a coordinated RM approach across the CGIAR. *Wadsworth* reported that current activities of the FO continue to focus on aligning work with the transition process, attracting new donors, shifting existing donors to multiannual pledging, and exploring new financing mechanisms and roles for prospective partners.

On the creation of the Transition Plan and the Transition Team (TT), *Wadsworth* reported that the Fund Council agreed at FC13 to establish a CGIAR System Organization, including a CGIAR System Council and a CGIAR System Office, building on the existing legal personality of the Consortium. He explained that the TT's main task will be to establish the new CGIAR System, based on the Fund Council decision to establish a unified governance structure. He described the composition and objectives of the TT for the purpose of managing the implementation. The areas of work for the TT will include establishing a legal framework and legal arrangements, fiduciary services, and governance. It will also advise on predictable and sustainable financing, and the creation of a CGIAR System Office. The TT is also expected to work on the relationships between the CGIAR System Organization (Council and Office) and the Centers, the global development agenda, and the ISPC. He also described all the steps and processes of the Transition Plan during 2015-2016.

*Wadsworth* discussed the CRP-II Call process and timeline, as agreed at FC13. He reported on the process of recruitment of ISPC Council members, facilitated by the FO; and presented a brief update on CRP IEA evaluations received by the FO. He closed by describing the strategy and activities of Fund Office communications.

#### iv. IEA

*Rachel Bedouin*, Head of the IEA, presented an [update on the recent activities of the IEA](#). Reviews and evaluations conducted or initiated by IEA include 2 general reviews completed (Generation Challenge Program; CRP Governance and Management), 5 CRP evaluations completed (PIM, AAS, WHEAT, MAIZE, FTA), 5 CRP evaluations ongoing (CCAFS, GRiSP, Livestock & Fish, RTB, and WLE), and 5 CRP-commissioned evaluations with IEA QA advice (Humidtropics, A4NH, Grain Legumes, Dryland Cereals, and Drylands). She reported on the general time line of the evaluations and noted that a general synthesis of all 15 CRP evaluations will be reported in April 2016. Bedouin presented a brief overview of the scope for a synthesis of the first five completed CRP evaluations (FTA, WHEAT, MAIZE, AAS and PIM), which covers analysis of the following criteria: CRP as an umbrella program, funding of CRP, quality of science, partnerships, gender, capacity development, and outcomes/impacts.

*Bedouin* described the other IEA initiatives and events for 2015 and the IEA work plan for 2016, which will include thematic evaluations (Gender, Partnerships, Capacity Development), evaluation of the CRP Genebanks, a Synthesis of 15 CRP evaluations (for 2017), peer review of the IEA, a coordinated plan for evaluation of CRP-II, and an action plan for supporting decentralized evaluations.

A general discussion followed the updates from the four system units. *Doug Gollin*, Council member, initiated the discussion with three questions, on the delivery of the CGIAR research outcomes on genetics gains, the measurement of genetic gains in farmers' fields, and on gender and youth as a component of the pathways to impact. In response, *Powell* noted that the investments being made by the CGIAR are going to deliver ever higher rates of genetic gains (1.5-2.0%); he added that the Consortium is currently looking at the portfolio from a number of perspectives, to be more strategic and more transparent about how funding resources will be used. On the measurement of genetic gains, he stressed that the need to accelerate genetic gain, as presented in the SRF, is a major challenge, and that there are various ways of accurately measuring genetic gain realized in farmers' fields. *Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium CEO, added that the intent is to think about outcomes, going from research results to development, not only what has been achieved in terms of variety releases. He also requested SPIA's advice on methods for measuring genetic gains in farmers' fields. *Gollin* commented that for youth, sometimes the best way is to get them out of agriculture; he noted that the issue of youth seems to be blurred with capacity development, and to address this issue on youth, there is a need to bring together several aspects including labour, markets, structural transformation, in a much more holistic way. *Rijsberman* Consortium Office commented that even with youth leaving agriculture, some 60% of workers in Africa are employed in agriculture and will continue to be employed in agriculture. Hence the question is how to generate dynamic agricultural employment for youth. He reported that the CO had proposed a platform on the private sector and youth, but the Consortium Board did not think CGIAR was ready. There is a lot of ongoing work and investments in youth, for instance by the AfDB in Africa.

*Tom Tomich*, Council member, commented on the existence of much evidence on the importance of agricultural productivity and structural transformation; the broader science is well-established. He informed the participants that the next Science Forum (in April 2016) will be about rural prosperity and agricultural research. Although it might be too late to help in shaping the full proposals, it could be important in CRP implementation. *Tomich* suggested a meta-analysis of the existing IEA evaluations, and made two requests for possible topics to be considered: an operational interpretation of what an international public good (IPG) is – i.e.

how is it interpreted across CRPs; and good practices in AR4D - what partnerships really mean – since it is difficult to evaluate it based on extensive lists of partners. In response, *Rachel Bedouin*, pointed out that the meaning of an IPG comes across in all evaluations. The IEA is working on the synthesis of the first five CRP evaluations, and next year will include all 15 CRP evaluations, to feed into the CRP-II full proposal process. She added that the IEA is planning to look at various types of partnerships across the CGIAR, but it is a difficult topic to evaluate and it is currently under-evaluated, even in the IEA. *Tomich* wondered how best to articulate the impact pathway for knowledge, since much of the CGIAR IPGs are on advancing knowledge. There is a need to be sharper operationally, about how this occurs, since it influences the way proposals are written. *Maggie Gill* referred to Jim Ryan’s paper on IPGs (2006).

*Sirkka Immonen* (IEA) reported that breeding was considered as a quality of science issue in the IEA evaluations, but expressed concerns about the counterfactuals. Since the environment is changing, it is possible that yield gain is sometimes taken as a measure of genetic gain. *Graham Theile* (observer) pointed out that sometimes just ‘standing still’ in the face of a changing climate can be a genetic gain. *Rodomiro Ortiz* (observer) commented that we should breed to close yields gaps, rather than for yield potential. *Gollin* noted that farmers generally respond to genetic gains by reallocating inputs and management.

*Kwesi Atta-Krah* (observer) commented on the low level on W1/2 funding and the initial hope that it would be around 50-60% of total funding. Now it seems that bilateral funding is once again the order of the day. *Jonathan Wadsworth* replied that one could argue that the ideal scenario would be to have all funding in W1, but donors will continue to make choices. As W1/2 funding is falling, we must wait to see if bilateral and W3 funding increase proportionately. He mentioned that a large part of the W1/W2 decrease is driven by one or two donors. *Rijsberman, Consortium Office*, remarked that the share of W1/2 can be viewed as a measure of the success of the previous reform, and the W1/2 level was highest just after the previous reform. *Eric Witte* (USAID) noted that donors need to know what they are getting for money invested. W3/bilateral funding has therefore seen the most growth.

### **Agenda Item 3. Strengthening FAO and CGIAR linkages**

Major internal reform processes within both CGIAR and FAO have been undertaken in recent years. Providing an overview of FAO’s new Strategic Framework, *Ren Wang*, Assistant Director-General, Department of Agriculture, argued that having a more transparent set of common strategic objectives helps to clarify opportunities for collaboration between CGIAR and FAO. *Wang* argued that the inter-governmental platform offered by FAO is a unique strength and gave the example of the forthcoming Committee on Food Security meetings in Rome, which provides the opportunity for bringing key research topics to the attention of a high-level forum. *Wang* acts as focal point within FAO for CGIAR relations, but emphasized that he draws on the contributions of more than 20 colleagues in this process.

FAO supported the process of CGIAR reform, and *Wang* welcomed the recommendation for a strengthened ISPC, despite the fact that FAO is no longer providing a contribution to the operational budget of the ISPC. In taking the decision to no longer fund ISPC operational activities, FAO was “sending a signal” to the CGIAR that it is not a donor but rather FAO sees itself as a strategic partner of CGIAR.

Two of the five Coordinators for Strategic Objectives in the new FAO structure were then invited to provide some examples of how FAO sees its collaboration with CGIAR. *Clayton Campanhola*, Coordinator for Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) – ‘Make agriculture, forestry, and fisheries more productive and sustainable’ - presented [FAO’s cross-cutting and cross-sectoral concern for sustainability issues](#). FAO has a number of different collaborations with CGIAR on climate smart agriculture (CIMMYT, ICRAF, CCAFS); on ecosystem services (IRRI, ICARDA, ILRI); on efficient resource-use and sustainable intensification (Bioversity, ICARDA, IITA, IWMI); and a new book entitled *Save and Grow in practice*, soon to be launched, and which builds on work with CIMMYT, IRRI and ICARDA on applications of resource-conserving technologies. *Campanhola* stated that there are a number of areas that FAO would like to work with CGIAR on further, particularly in relation to ecosystem services and on nutrition-sensitive agriculture.

*Dominique Burgeon*, Coordinator for Strategic Objective 5 (SO5) – ‘Increasing resilience of rural livelihoods to threats and crises’ – explained how the new strategic objective structure aims to mobilize expertise from across FAO’s departments to help achieve impact. *Burgeon* argued that food crises are increasingly taking on a protracted nature, and that the international community needs a different approach. Outlining FAO’s approach, *Burgeon* noted that the heads of the Rome-based UN agencies – FAO/IFAD/WFP – have agreed to have a common effort on resilience, and to talk and coordinate better despite different ways of working and partnerships. With ICARDA, seed production within Syria remains in the spotlight as NGOs are bringing seeds in from all over the world which puts at risk the results of decades of agricultural research.

*Karen Nichterlein* from the Research and Extension Unit of FAO leads an internal network to guide FAO-CGIAR relations, with all FAO technical divisions and regional offices represented. In 2013 there was a follow-up to the Memorandum of Understanding between CGIAR and FAO and three areas for strategic collaboration were agreed, namely: gender equity, where there has been some progress; upscaling, which is the focus of a lot of activity now; and metrics, for impact assessment, M&E and understanding the contribution to SDGs, which has seen limited progress to date. *Nichterlein* underlined the fact that there are many areas of ongoing collaboration at the level of individual centers/CRPs, and quoted surveyed FAO staff on how CGIAR adds value to the FAO mandate. CGIAR is seen positively as bringing in science to build the evidence base to support policy making, whereas a number of challenges identified by staff were largely in relation to administrative difficulties/funding delays.

*Doris Soto* from the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department gave a brief insight into the [relationship between FAO and WorldFish](#), covering a number of collaborations on projects in Bangladesh, Myanmar and at the regional level for Sub-Saharan Africa.

*Wayne Powell*, CGIAR Consortium Chief Scientific Officer, responded on behalf of the CGIAR. Noting the similarity between FAO and CGIAR strategic frameworks, *Powell* said that the second call for CRP proposals provided an opportunity to maximize on the collaboration. A number of topics were mentioned that had joint strategic relevance, including: having a systems view on productivity, sustainability, resilience; levers of diet change in the developing world; climate smart agriculture, and soil, water and land management; the need to strengthen information systems and analyses that underpin agricultural development initiatives; site integration and the growth of country offices; biodiversity and sustainable intensification; nutrient-rich crops and their stability under a changing climate; agricultural

informatics for measuring and monitoring impacts at scale, to generate knowledge and design further research.

Council member *Doug Gollin* reinforced the idea that there is potential for coordination on metrics for impact assessment, and that SPIA would be very interested to take advantage of collection of data by national statistical services, asking whether SPIA could help in brokering improvements in agricultural statistics at country level. Council member *Jeff Sayer* asked how ‘landscapes’, which includes all sectoral issues, fit in the FAO Strategic Objective structure? *Campanhola* responded by saying that integration at geographical scales cuts across the individual departments of FAO, so the Strategic Objectives have helped with giving the departments a way of working together. Council member *Marcio de Miranda Santos* noted the shift from commodity to agri-food systems CRPs, which opens up a previously narrow focus on productivity to allow for more collaboration on a broader basis.

Returning to the funding relationship between CGIAR and FAO, Council member *Segenet Kelemu* stated that CGIAR needs to look for resource mobilization from new sources such as the African Development Bank. *Wang* explained that FAO is pushing to have 1% of agricultural GDP re-invested in agricultural research but that most of the SSA countries have not done that. The FAO Director General has made a personal emphasis on the importance of funding agricultural research. ISPC Chair *Maggie Gill* asked how many opportunities there really are for funding across the research and development divide. If the answer is that there are few opportunities, the related question is how far research funding should go in trying to achieve development outcomes? *Soto* stated that across EU, private foundations, the Green Climate Fund, and public-private partnerships, it is possible to find some kind of balance across sources of funding. *Burgeon* explained that there has been a 550% increase over 10 years in the amount of aid going to humanitarian crises, but that despite this being a challenging environment for resource mobilization, joint approaches to requests from donors are more likely to work.

*Powell* explained that the changing science landscape is something that helps collaboration and can speed it up. Observer *Ruben Echeverria* argued for much greater input from FAO into the CRPs – that FAO is the global center for food and agriculture – and because of the challenges facing the world, new approaches are needed. To give an example, the CRP steering committees have very few experts on them from FAO and it would be beneficial if there could be more, but this would require greater FAO flexibility. Observer *Carlos Sere* argued that CGIAR expertise can improve the quality of investments made by FAO. Observer *Harold Roy-Macauley* made a plea to make partnerships more visible – to see FAO projects being hosted by CGIAR centers and having FAO project staff within the CGIAR centers. Observer *Rodney Cooke* asked how best to operationalize the complementarities, noting that there is senior-level support for more strategic integration. Observer *Victor Kommerell* posed the challenge to FAO to have input into the new CRP pre-proposals, which he saw as a very practical next step in closer partnership, but noted that it is the Windows 1 and 2 funds that provide core support for these kinds of collaborations and that these have been cut again.

Concluding, *Wang* expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to speak, and clarified that where there are common CGIAR-FAO activities, there is nothing to prevent FAO from bringing additional financial resources to those issues.

#### **Agenda Item 4. ISPC Task Force**

Following the recommendations of the CGIAR Reform MTR Report, at FC12, the Fund Council endorsed the establishment of a Task Force (TF) to consider how the ISPC could be strengthened. This TF was established, chaired by ISPC Chair Maggie Gill, and it has now produced its draft report, which has been sent to the Fund Council for consideration. *Maggie Gill* presented the [Task Force's draft recommendations](#) and their implications for the CGIAR.

The main conclusion of the TF analysis is that attention to science quality and strategic thinking at the System level have suffered from the disconnectedness between the different System entities created as part of the Reform process, coupled with the number of Boards, panels, and committees which are involved in science quality and developing strategies at different levels. Furthermore, the ISPC has become disconnected from the science leadership of the CGIAR. The TF endorsed the principle of 'independence' of the ISPC, but considered that this should be interpreted as independence from decision making and not independence from the System. It also endorsed the inclusion of 'partnership' in the remit of the ISPC and considered it should be a key player in taking an overview of strategies for effective partnerships along the research for development (R4D) continuum. Recognizing that in some cases ISPC advice has not been actioned, the TF endorsed the MTR recommendation that the ISPC should be empowered to be proactive not just in the provision of advice but also in assessing the response by the System and reporting to the FC (in future the SC). This should include engaging in dialogue with the donors on strategic issues, such as the positioning of the CRPs on the R4D continuum.

The TF vision is for the future ISPC to provide intellectual leadership by giving scientific direction to the CGIAR at the System level, in terms of: scientific foresight and prioritization, assessment and delivery of science quality, strategic approaches to partnership with respect to both science quality and delivery of impact, and the development of a rigorous impact culture across the System. To raise its influence and profile, the ISPC needs to adopt a more proactive communication strategy, involving communication professionals.

The operational implications of the TF recommendations were summarized as follows:

*Foresight and Prioritization:* The ISPC should be tasked with conducting scientific foresight exercises for the System, drawing on multiple approaches, and integrated into a prioritization framework, to be used by the System Council (SC) in allocation of resources. The ISPC should lead a System-wide Foresight and Prioritization network, drawing on all relevant information and avoiding duplication of effort. The ISPC should also lead discussions on strategic science issues at SC meetings.

*Science quality - leadership and capacity, management and ex-ante assessment:* The ISPC remit should be expanded beyond its current focus on ex-ante assessment of science quality within CRPs. It should have a remit to ensure that management of science quality is consistent across the System. This will require agreement between System bodies on criteria and methods of assessment; oversight to ensure that *all significant* programs (however funded) have been subject to external peer review; closer working with IEA on assessment of science quality in the evaluations; and responsibility to report to the SC on science quality. This will require

closer engagement with the IEA, System Office (SO), science committees of Center Boards, and Independent Steering Committees of CRPs. The ISPC should continue to challenge relevant capacity within the System through regular reviews.

*Science quality – program monitoring and evaluation:* The current division of responsibilities between the CO and the IEA for program monitoring and program evaluation should be maintained. However, the ISPC should ensure effective dialogue on science quality and future science direction to make annual reports to the SC, recommending actions to address science quality issues. The IEA should review non-lead Centers contributing to the CGIAR portfolio at roughly quinquennial intervals, involving the ISPC in the planning and discussion of the science quality assessments.

*Partnerships:* Partnerships are an important part of the delivery mechanism of both science quality and impact. The ISPC should convene a network on partnerships for impact with representation from across the System (including GFAR, IEA, SO, Centers and CRPs) to develop a strategic vision on partnerships along the whole R4D continuum.

*Impact:* Donors require independent recording and increased capacity to create outcomes and development impacts from the CGIAR. This includes the strengthening of appropriate data collection, program-for-impact design and partnerships, in all of which the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) is already active. However, it is necessary to plan sufficient funds for impact assessment both at the Center/CRP level and for ISPC (SPIA).

*Gill* reported that these recommendations would substantially increase the work load of the ISPC, necessitating the recruitment of an additional Council member and secretariat staff. The ISPC annual budget would therefore increase by about \$1.3 million, once these recommendations were fully implemented. The expected benefits to the System would be stronger scientific leadership, making greater use of the skills and experience across the System through better co-ordination on key issues. The ISPC would continue to be a body independent of decision-making, providing advice to the SC, including evidence-based tools for resource allocation, an enhanced understanding of partnerships, regular assessments of progress on improving science quality across the System, and identifying new scientific opportunities.

Council member *Marcio de Miranda Santos* emphasized the importance of the ISPC maintaining the maximum possible independence. He reiterated that ISPC work on Foresight would be largely compiling and synthesizing work already done elsewhere; but for strategic foresight, the ISPC should develop its own methodology. Council member *Jeff Sayer* endorsed the need for more contact with Center Board and CRP committees; and observer *Victor Kommerel* suggested utilizing donors' advisers. *Rodney Cooke*, a member of the TF, reminded participants that the TF had had only three months to produce their draft report, which was a very short timeframe. He had shared it with Center Boards, but had received little feedback to date. Observers generally supporting the TF recommendations included *Echeverria*, *Atta-Krah*, *Long* and *Hubert*. *Wadsworth* confirmed the need for a strengthened ISPC, but was not clear on its implementation in the new CGIAR structure.

## Agenda Item 5. Prioritisation

### *i. Global Futures*

*Keith Weibe*, Senior Research Fellow at IFPRI, [presented a quantitative foresight \(namely, IMPACT\)](#) modeling approach to inform prioritization-related activities in the CGIAR. IMPACT is a system of models, with the Global Multi-market Model at its core. One of the (many) advantages of IMPACT is that it is highly disaggregated – it can account for specific geographies, commodities etc. Using a recent modeling exercise on climate impacts on agriculture (both biophysical and economic effects), *Weibe* illustrated how IMPACT could be used. In this case, the CCAFS CRP, with links to a larger group of stakeholders, provided qualitative inputs on the kinds of scenarios that would be helpful to them (in their specific regions). Another source of demand for such data is the private sector – Lloyds, for instance, commissioned work on risks of extreme events, particularly climate shocks, on the global food system, and the implications for food security and the insurance industry.

While the IMPACT team does not work on climate modeling, it is possible for data on general circulation models to be fed into IMPACT. CGIAR Centers provided estimates of final adoption of technologies still under development for this work. In the example used, scenarios were generated based on Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) i.e. income, population, agricultural technology adoption etc. and Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) using information on changes in climate (radiative forcing, CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the atmosphere, etc.). Results can be generated on a year-on-year basis, but 2050 was the farthest they could go – the limited timescale in the case of climate modeling is because the uncertainty grows larger after that. A number of improvements are underway for IMPACT: (i) IMPACT is improving representation of livestock and fish data; (ii) On indicators like nutrition, they are going beyond calorific content to look at micro-nutrients; and (iii) Relatedly, on health, a team from Oxford is looking at long-term drivers of changes in diet (fruit, vegetable, meat composition).

### *ii. Qualitative prioritization framework – preliminary analysis*

*Timothy Kelley*, Senior Agricultural Research Office, ISPC [presented an approach to, and results from, a \(pilot\) qualitative prioritization exercise](#). This activity, completed between June and August 2015, was in response to the charge given to ISPC by CGIAR donors at the 13<sup>th</sup> Fund Council (Bogor), and was intended to inform ISPC's review of CRP pre-proposals (and full proposals). While prioritization frameworks typically focus on the entire chain – all the way from investments to outputs, this was meant to focus only on sub-IDOs. The analysis was undertaken in two separate spheres: *donors* were asked to indicate their institutional priorities for sub-IDOs, and *experts* were asked to draw on their knowledge of agricultural R&D pathways to rate sub-IDOs against specific criteria (relevance of sub-IDO to SLO, centrality of agricultural research to achievement of the sub-IDO, comparative advantage of the CGIAR). In completing this exercise, it was recognized that sub-IDOs are open to interpretation, that sub-IDOs are often inter-linked and some may be a necessary condition for others, or impacting one may mean impacting several, and that development strategies are oftentimes contextual (with variation by country or within countries).

For the **online survey of donors**, representatives of the Funders Forum were asked to allocate 45 points (in total) across the 45 uniquely defined sub-IDOs in the CGIAR SRF 2016-2030 – this forced them to make choices. Allocations were meant to reflect the relative importance of

each sub-IDO to their organizations. Of the 70 stakeholders and donors approached, 19 responded (response rate of 27%) – however 15 of these respondents contributed 59% of the overall CGIAR funding in the year 2014<sup>1</sup>. It is hard to make conclusive statements about priorities based on total points assigned to each sub-IDO – however, varying degrees of discrimination were evident<sup>2</sup>. Among other results, two sub-IDOs (*enhanced genetic gain* and *reduced pre- and post-harvest losses*) received the highest number of points, and *increased safe use of inputs* and *enhancement of animal and plant biodiversity* were given the least weight.

Twenty international agricultural research and development experts<sup>3</sup> were approached for the **expert opinion exercise**, of which eight were willing and able to commit time to this activity. Experts were asked to assign a score of 1(low)-5(high) to each sub-IDO (51 in number) against a set of criteria<sup>4</sup>, including relevance of the sub-IDO for achieving the SLO, and centrality of agricultural research to this sub-IDO. Since expert rating scales differed, so in order to establish consensus opinion, scores were normalized, and a combined relevance and centrality score was generated to form the ISPC rating. Six high priority sub-IDOs under the three SLOs, and four additional high priority sub-IDOs under the cross-cutting themes, were identified, including *enhanced genetic gain (SLO2)*. An additional eight sub-IDOs were rated moderate-high priority, two as moderate priority, and 31 sub-IDOs rated low priority, including *increased safe use of inputs* and *enhancement of animal and plant biodiversity*.

Finally, the results from expert opinion and donor survey were compared to sub-IDOs targeted in the CRP pre-proposals. From the CRP pre-proposals, it was evident that a large number of Flagships (FPs) targeted sub-IDOs in SLO1 and three of the four cross-cutting themes (gender, policies and institutions, and capacity development), and there are fewer FPs targeting SLOs 2 and 3. After matching results from the qualitative prioritization exercise to sub-IDOs targeted in CRP pre-proposals, one of many conclusions is that several high priority sub-IDOs are also targeted by a high number of FPs. It is also interesting to note that a number of high and moderate-high priority sub-IDOs are concentrated in SLO3 and climate change cross-cutting theme which is not where FPs are targeting the most sub-IDOs. *Kelley* concluded the presentation by raising questions on the implications of this preliminary exercise: recognizing the caveats, what is the extent to which information presented could be useful for evaluating CRP strength and relevance in this pre-proposal stage; and how the methodology can be refined for a more robust analysis of full proposals.

*Maggie Gill*, ISPC Chair, commenting on the prioritization exercise, emphasized the importance of understanding the donor perspective, even as perspectives vary and priorities change. At the same time, it is important to make decisions based on science and quality of science. The aspiration for such a qualitative prioritization exercise was that it would take the dialogue forward – although there were concerns about sub-IDOs, the sub-IDOs needed to be framed to ensure there would be a second call. She noted that there is not a template for prioritization – while the IMPACT model is helpful, it cannot be used by itself either, and that one can learn how to do this as one goes through the process.

---

<sup>1</sup> 12 of the 19 respondents contributed to Windows 1, 2 and 3 and represent 62% of the W1/2/3 contributions in 2014.

<sup>2</sup> 8 respondents assigned 0 points to at least 20 sub-IDOs, 13 donors assigned 0 points to at least 10 sub-IDOs, but 3 donors assigned 1 point to each sub-IDO

<sup>3</sup> These experts represented multiple disciplines: economics, agricultural R&D, biophysical science, international development, donors, and ex-CGIAR.

<sup>4</sup> Five criteria were proposed of which the above mentioned two were the ones sub-IDOs were assessed against (by experts). One expert rated sub-IDOs against the criterion ‘comparative advantage of the CGIAR in achieving the sub-IDO’. The other two of five were: International Public Goods (IPGs) orientation of CGIAR to achieve the sub-IDO and expectation of delivery in the short- and long-term.

*Tom Tomich*, Council Member, noted that the CGIAR will prioritize programs by IDOs at the portfolio level, and these were not independent choices since some sub-IDOs are connected. What configuration of tools and experts can IMPACT put together for this? *Doug Gollin*, Council Member, noted that a formidable effort went into constructing the Global Futures work. In modeling, the key issue is the assumptions that go into the model – these drive the process completely. One could look at different geographic focus areas, or priority crops, but these would have to translate into parameters. How does IMPACT think through moving from quantity of investment into a change in parameter in the model? In response, *Weibe* noted that going from research inputs to outcomes is a critical part of developing scenarios – one has to look at the literature, and what experts have found in different contexts. For instance, as an exercise for feeding into the SRF in 2009, different storylines were constructed e.g. if x resulted in a y% increase in yields in a specific country, and it is possible to test the sensitivity of y. One has to have confidence in sources of information – this can come from literature or further consultation with experts. *Gollin* reflecting on *Weibe*'s point about difficulties in mapping expenditures to outcomes thought there might be virtue in pursuing this, and to undertake a wider range of simulations.

*Carlos Sere* (observer), commenting on the qualitative prioritization, stated that this was a bold step forward and suggested that the expert opinion (in the next round) could utilize the Delphi method. He also noted that a lot of evidence/data is available for major staples – an information asymmetry that makes the exercise akin to ‘looking under the lamp post for the keys’. Along similar lines, *Rodney Cooke* (observer) noted that a number of sub-IDOs would be ‘dismissed’ (considered low priority) if one were to consider these expert opinion results, a surprisingly large number of them being in the NRM domain. Furthermore, despite the importance of comparative advantage as a criterion to the FC, expert opinion on it could not be solicited. *Graham Thiele* (observer) suggested that the experts could be limited to the (same) 45 points as the donors, and that one would need to think more about picking the constituency of experts (the process). In response to these comments, *Kelley* asked what it would take to get the data that would allow such comparisons, and agreed that one of the many caveats to the pilot exercise was the fact that a wider pool of experts was needed who would be able to think about comparative advantage or IPG from an outcome angle. In the pilot phase, experts (mostly economists) were much more comfortable thinking about research outputs. *Tomich* added that the questions *Sere* raised were a researchable topic in and of themselves. *Marcio de Miranda Santos*, Council Member, also concurred that this was an interesting exercise to look at the portfolio as a whole with additional sampling, validation methods etc. In terms of utility in this round of results for the pre-proposal review, it would be interesting to look at the extremes (i.e. low and high priority sub-IDOs).

*Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium Office, encouraged the ISPC to push the donors further since their responses were not clearly distinguishable, and similarly the experts – since results of such an exercise could imply that CGIAR has to prioritize in terms of budgetary allocation. He also wondered what mapping Flagships to sub-IDOs signified. *Gill* responded that it was surprising how many pre-proposals targeted multiple sub-IDOs. She added that the prioritization exercise did help in a dialogue with donors: that if there had been 15 CRPs looking at *increased food safety* that may have been a signal. *Kelley* added that it would have been helpful to look at the intensity of efforts in these sub-IDOs, and that was not easy to do. *Long* (observer) from USAID, welcoming this kind of bootstrap analysis, noted that donors like to look at such data to understand if there is convergence. She added that ISPC could draw on the pool of experts in the Global Futures community of practice, and encouraged looking at costing – an important dimension – at the Flagship level. *Bernard Hubert* (observer) noted that this exercise could be viewed as a roadmap, and that it was interesting to see how donors rated

various sub-DOs differently. Some other observers also wondered if there was a relationship between the level of investment in the CGIAR by donors, and the level of selectivity. *Charlotte Lusty* (observer) expressed concern that enabling activities, such as genebank maintenance, were not considered.

## **Agenda Item 6. Strategy and Trends**

### ***i. Strategic Foresight - ISPC's contribution to foresight analysis vis-à-vis roles of other key players***

This section of the meeting consisted of four presentations related to Foresight. The first presenter was *Marie Gasquet* from the Consortium Office. She presented an [overview of the foresight activities in the Consortium office](#) and the CRPs, and explained that foresight has three main elements: anticipation; appropriation (participatory), and action. The presentation also highlighted the differences between strategic and scientific foresight. Strategic foresight looks back to imagine future challenges, whilst scientific foresight identifies research topics with highest knowledge expectation and transformational breakthrough potential to promote high quality research. The presentation also informed the meeting on the memorandum of understanding between the CO and CIRAD on foresight activities. This collaboration has thus far produced nine foresight briefs. Part of the objective of this collaboration is to harmonize foresight methods used by CRPs, and to assist in moving towards the implementation of foresight at the systems level, not in every CRP.

*Robin Bourgeois* from GFAR, informed the meeting about GFAR's first Constituent Assembly, which had just taken place in Thailand. In addition, he spoke about [GFAR's collective action](#), which is focusing on new challenges/opportunities related to the future of food and nutritional security. The ethics of foresight is one of the preoccupations of the Global Foresight Hub, which runs the Grassroots Foresight Initiative to assist in the building of local action plans – “empowering farmers to negotiate their own futures.” In respect to the prioritization of DOs and sub-DO, the *Bourgeois* suggested that it would be necessary to implement matrix analysis to ensure that the systemic nature of sub-DOs linkages is not ignored.

*Keith Weibe* from IFPRI, presented [work on strategic foresight by IFPRI](#), the Global Futures and Strategic Foresight (GFSF), and the Agricultural Model Inter-comparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP). Using long-term total global demand, yield and trade projections to 2050, these exercises look at the estimated impacts on food security in different climate change scenarios.

Finally, in his [presentation](#), *Marcio de Miranda Santos*, Council Member, looked at the power of social network analysis in exploring collaboration and network evolution. He showed examples of applying such analysis to the evolution of collaborations between organisations in response to funding incentives

The subsequent discussion highlighted that whilst there are many great tools and ideas on foresight, the impact of these exercises is not always evident. In addition, it supported the proposal that understanding structural/causal relationships among sub-DOs is important for priority setting, and that staff responsible for M&E in the CRPs should be integral to this exercise.

In respect of network analysis, it was observed that this is very akin to what is seen in the corporate world, and that this presents a wealth of business intelligence that can be harvested. The meeting was also informed of an additional foresight study on diets, which looks at actual human consumption. The results of this work will be presented during Rio 2016. Finally, it was proposed that the CGIAR should further explore the collation, outsourcing and coordination of foresight activities, and that the ISPC's role in this respect should be strengthened.

*ii. Update on the study of development corridors*

*Jeff Sayer*, Council Member, presented a brief [update on the development corridors for agricultural growth study](#). This topic is of importance to the CGIAR, as investment in these corridors is increasing and there is a tendency for corridors to exclude the poorest and deepen existing power disparities. A background study on this trend has been finalized and preparations to organize a bespoke stakeholder workshop in South Africa continue.

The subsequent discussion concluded that the CGIAR and CRPs should link some of the proposed integrated sites to development corridors. In addition, there appears to be a dichotomy between the approaches of different donors: Should research aim for impact now, or to support the farmers of the future?

**Agenda Item 7. Mobilizing science**

*i. Partnership study*

*Jeroen Dijkman*, ISPC Secretariat, presented an overview of the ISPC study on [Good practice in AR4D partnership](#) that was currently in draft form. He explained that part of the context of such a review was that the CGIAR has recently linked its SLOs to the achievement of the post-2015 SDGs, thus signalling the need to embed its work within the wider architecture of partnerships, platforms and networks. The CGIAR has also declared itself one of the world's leading publicly funded AR4D partnerships, signalling a transition from a role of planning and leading research to a role of contributing to wider innovation processes where partnership modalities will be critical. The purpose of this ISPC study was to synthesize emerging patterns of good practice in multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs), to arrive at some general principles of engagement, and to discuss some of the implications for CGIAR practice and positioning.

He noted that although there is confusion over the definition of partnership, it is clear that MSPs represent a specific form of partnership. The rationale for forming MSP groupings varies considerably in the literature, but can be categorized as follows: economic efficiency (value for money); inclusiveness and governance; complexity and 'wicked' problems. The operational manifestation of MSPs also reveals different forms of practice based on goals. He then presented four different modes of partnership – two traditional modes, and two modes where a systemic change agenda informs partnership practice.

*Dijkman* further elaborated on the similarities and differences between MSPs practice in AR4D and global MSPs for development practice. In moving towards MSP good practice, three issues stand out that have relevance for the AR4D community: strengthening MSP platform architectures; clarifying roles within emerging architectures; and, strengthening learning and capacity building. The implications of this study for the CGIAR are challenging, but not new. The real challenge for the CGIAR is how it engages in the realities of the systemic change agenda implied by the SDGs, as well as the increasing recognition of the complexity of many

of the agricultural development and food security challenges with which it is mandated. A related point concerns how the CGIAR as a science agency could best add value to the effectiveness of MSP architectures for systemic change. As a way forward, the study illustrates different types and modes of partnership on the local to systemic change continuum and suggests appropriate roles the CGIAR could play at these different levels.

*Dijkman* concluded his presentation with some key messages from the study: impact at scale means systemic change; the CGIAR will need to play different roles at different levels in global MSPs; and, establishing the scientific basis to link MSP practice with impact.

The ensuing discussion revolved around the CGIAR's engagement in the different modes of partnership, as well as the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in each of those modes. There is a need to look beyond the CGIAR always being a leader to improving partnerships where the CGIAR is taking advantage of others' expertise. A lot of the CGIAR funding flows to other partner organizations - new thinking is required in order to stretch the dollar of the CGIAR and its role as a secondary player, especially in Africa.

Additional issues raised included incorporating the history of the CGIAR partnership surveys in the study, distilling information for guidance to the CRPs, focusing on the innovation web rather than a linear chain and agreeing on metrics for evaluating partnerships. The IEA is also evaluating partnerships and it was suggested that it should work together with the ISPC to look at drivers and why certain partnership practices evolved. Another critical issue raised was consideration of specific recommendations on the constraints that the CGIAR faces as a system. The CRPs have narrow experience in terms of partnerships and it is necessary to identify who within the CGIAR has the capacity to embed learning and capture it systematically.

## *ii. Science Forum 2016 planning*

*Preet Lidder*, ISPC Secretariat, [introduced the topic](#) by stating that the [Science Forum \(SF\)](#) series is a flagship event initiated by the ISPC in 2009 under its remit of mobilizing science for development as a means of reaching out to scientists and scientific communities, largely external to the CGIAR, but who have potentially important contributions to make to the CGIAR research portfolio. Three SFs have been held to date. The first SF was held in Wageningen, the Netherlands, in 2009 on *Science for Development: Mobilizing Global Linkages*. Key papers produced were published in a special issue of the journal *Crop Science*. The second SF, on *The Agriculture - Environment Nexus*, was held in co-operation with the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences in 2011 in Beijing, China. Selected papers from the 2011 SF were published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. The most recent SF in 2013 focussed on *Nutrition and Health Outcomes: Targets for Agricultural Research* and was held in Bonn, Germany. It was co-hosted by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Germany. Ten original refereed papers, together with an introductory paper, were recently published (in June) in a special section of the journal *Food Security*.

The last two Science Fora focused on research and partnership issues related to the CGIAR SLOs on agriculture and the environment and the potential contribution of agriculture to nutrition and health outcomes. Thus for 2016, in response to the SRF having 3 SLOs, and with suggestions from the Consortium and Centers, the ISPC selected the topic: *Agricultural research for rural prosperity: rethinking the pathways* to focus on the SLO which has not yet

been addressed in a SF - the contribution of agriculture to reducing poverty. The main objective of SF16 is to *rethink the pathways for agricultural research to stimulate inclusive development of rural economies in an era of climate change. The Forum will marshal evidence and build on lessons learned to date, to suggest an updated list of priority research areas and approaches which involve more strategic and inclusive engagement with partners.* SF16 will be co-hosted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and will be held from 12-14 April 2016 in Addis Ababa, with an expected contribution from IFAD, and in collaboration with ILRI and other CGIAR centers hosted at the ILRI campus in Addis. The target number of participants is expected to be 250-300, which is similar to the previous Fora.

*Lidder* then presented an overview of the draft program for SF16. Three full days would be allocated for the scientific debate, with an approximately 50:50 split of plenary papers and discussion sessions. Day 1 would focus on learning from experience, i.e. what does the evidence tell us about which pathways have worked and how has the challenge changed? What are the TOCs that link agricultural research to poverty reduction? Day 2 would then delve into the regional context, i.e. how does the challenge of poverty vary between regions and how does this influence the uptake pathways and hence the research approach in different regions of the world? Day 3 was not as well developed as the other two days – however the proposal was to emphasize what all this meant for International Public Goods research and how should we prioritize research areas and identify new approaches to research? A field visit would be organized on the fourth day.

The ISPC would seek diversity in participation and presentations, including representatives from donor agencies, NGOs, and the private sector as well as researchers both from within and external to the CGIAR. The goal will be to have 50% female presenters, and a significant proportion of presentations from Southern partners. The ISPC would also strive to enhance early career scientist professional development through better integration into the program. A Steering Committee (SC) had been established to advance progress with planning the SF program, and included Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair), Tom Tomich (ISPC member and University of California Davis), Gebisa Ejeta (Purdue University), Rashid Hassan (University of Pretoria), Anil Gupta (Honey Bee Network India), Bruce Campbell (Director CCAFS), Rajul Pandya-Lorch (IFPRI), Victor Konde (UNECA) and Preet Lidder (ISPC Secretariat). The SC had met a few times virtually and a site visit had taken place in July 2015. Next steps involved developing the draft program, identifying key speakers, confirming breakout session organizers, commission consultants for formulating background documents and launching the SF16 website.

In discussion, value chains and urban-rural linkages were mentioned as omissions. It was also flagged that although the GCARD3 dates had not been finalized yet, it was likely to take place in the first/second week of April 2016. As such, every effort should be made to avoid overlap and ensure that the timing was suitable for participation in both events.

### **Agenda Item 8. Impact assessment: Update on the SIAC program**

*Doug Gollin*, Chair of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), [presented an update](#) on the four-year program of work ([Strengthening Impact Assessment in the CGIAR 2013-2016](#)). While an interim synthesis report on SIAC outputs and outcomes for the four SIAC objectives will be available in early 2016, the presentation focused on select activities:

1. *Documenting NRM adoption using new technologies*: two of the studies commissioned through a competitive process ([activity 1.2](#)) managed by Michigan State University have now submitted final reports (that will be synthesized by MSU). Additionally, as an input to the collaborative work with World Bank LSMS-ISA team ([activity 2.4](#)), a SPIA Research Associate is testing the utility of combining drone imagery and remote sensing in Ethiopia to benchmark (against a household survey) and track adoption of conservation agriculture.
2. *Documenting adoption of improved crop varieties* ([activity 2.1](#)): adoption data has been collected, primarily through expert elicitation, for 85 of the 130 targeted crop-by-country combinations. MSU continues to work closely with the Centers to collate and selectively validate the data – there was some variance in progress by different Centers, and the timeline has been extended to April 2016 to allow completion of expert elicitations.
3. *Tracking policy-oriented research outcomes* ([activity 2.3](#)): Consultant Mitch Renkow has completed the first phase of work to identify intermediate outcomes (of the CGIAR) that have a bearing on macro level policies and practices plausibly linked to CGIAR outputs. Work to verify the inventory of outcomes completed and extending the inventory to include 2010-2014 outcomes is on-going. In 2016, SPIA will initiate a call to complete in-depth validation of a sub-set of these POR outcome claims.
4. *Impacts of widely-adopted CGIAR technologies* ([activity 3.1](#)): In July 2015, inception work with the seven research teams funded by SPIA (through a two-stage call process) was held at IFPRI. Many of these IA studies are already underway.
5. *Impacts of under-evaluated areas of research* ([activity 3.3](#)): Following a scoping study on impacts of irrigation and water management research in the CGIAR, a two-stage call for documenting the impacts of a wider set of under-evaluated areas of research (irrigation, agroforestry, livestock) was issued in August 2015. Eight of the 26 expressions of interest (EOIs) received were asked to submit full proposals, and decisions on funding will be made in December 2016. In addition, a draft of a scoping study on impacts of CGIAR research on livestock is now available for comments.

A full list of funded SIAC studies was provided as background material: most SIAC activities will continue through 2016/ mid-2017.

*Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair*, started the discussions by encouraging SPIA to get comments on the livestock scoping study. A question arose as to how SPIA disseminates information – who the target audience is, and how it will pull together the information and evidence from various studies it has commissioned. *Gollin* acknowledged the importance of dissemination, and underlined the fact that SPIA will produce an interim synthesis report in January 2016, followed by a full synthesis report in late 2017. *Jeff Sayer*, Council Member, mentioned the Cairns workshop on NRM of which SPIA was a part, and that issues in assessing larger scale NRM remain. *Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium Office, raised a question on the role of IAs in providing guidance at the system-level. *Gollin* stated that crop-level NRM is where it is easier to test methods in the field, and the lack of baseline data on so many levels makes it difficult to examine the larger questions – one would also need to think about whether CRPs should conduct IAs or whether it is a system-level function. *Patrick Webb*, observer, noted the importance of establishing attribution and assessing trade-offs (beyond establishing baselines) – as assessing impacts is not the same as assessing the value for money (a topic donors are interested in). *Gollin* agreed that SPIA consider this an important, but second order question – the priority is to establish that results have been achieved with CGIAR research which would otherwise not have been (counterfactual). Attribution is a key question for some research areas more than others (genetics), but as partnerships in the CGIAR expand, it would be important to document. It was pointed out by another observer that national programs often take the best

of various CGIAR technologies and develop them – this poses a problem of to whom to attribute the technology. *Gollin* responded that the DIIVA study addressed this problem, but that there is no single answer to the question.

*Ruben Echeverria*, observer, suggested the more we do on IA, the more we seem to need it – for instance, we thought that we understood diffusion, but recent work suggests that we know far less than we did. To understand diffusion, there is a reliance on experts and household surveys but, we are finding out that surveys are as unreliable as expert opinion. Hence, work on DNA fingerprinting has the potential to have revolutionary impacts, and he asked what SPIA's work suggests. He added that the less tangible part of this work is the community of practice and there is a need for the CGIAR to build it up, and persuade the donors to continue funding IA work. *Gollin*, in response, noted that as costs come down, large scale DNA fingerprinting will provide data that we currently do not have but, there are significant technical issues to be worked out. An option to consider is to preserve samples – so, even if fingerprinting is not done just now, it can be done in 10-20 years.

On the community of practice, he noted that it is far larger than the CGIAR – it includes national representatives, working with the LSMS-ISA etc. since a lot of the data on impact needs to come from outside of the CGIAR. Very little adoption data is being collected, not just on crop germplasm adoption, and collecting adoption/diffusion data is traditionally not a SPIA remit (but SPIA does this work recognizing the gap and its importance). He added, in response to another question on the challenge in measuring genetic gain and other potential indicators to measure, that SPIA would be happy to give some thought to the question (i.e. on what variables, other than adoption, should be measured).

An observer noted that work on counterfactuals is often done with data that is out of date. And, another asked if we have a handle on how research contributes to impact. *Gollin* pointed out that a case could be made that we know less today about impacts than 20 years ago – back in the 1980s, when one wanted to understand the impact of CGIAR work, one would look at say areas of semi-dwarf crop varieties. Even if there was not sufficient baseline data, when going out into the field, the probability was high that the technology was a CGIAR technology. Given the way the portfolio has shifted over the years, it has become more difficult to do document impacts – we did not have anything on adoption/diffusion in Africa till DIIVA. There has been some recent work (Will Martin's modeling paper, for instance) on how CGIAR investment in crop germplasm has resulted in poverty reduction. New technologies such as large scale DNA fingerprinting will hopefully provide information and answers that are currently not available. But we need to put in place mechanisms for better evidence in 10-15 years. SIAC has lots of very nicely framed studies where contribution of research to impacts can be shown in a rigorous way – there are lots of conjectures and patchy evidence about larger impacts, and we should be honest about that. *Timothy Kelley*, ISPC Secretariat, added that the DIIVA companion report has two well-done studies on the larger impacts – poverty impacts of maize and wheat varietal adoption. *Tom Tomich*, Council Member, added that one could ask donors what evidence they need for constituents since it is not just within agricultural research that we have a problem about evidence.

*Sirkka Immonen*, observer, remarked that varietal turnover rates are not as high as they used to be – the more recent varieties are not moving as fast; and added that one IEA evaluation found that there were too many baselines. *Gollin* stated that DIIVA has detailed information, and that good varieties persist in many cases. One of the reasons answering the question of what CGIAR impact has recently been difficult is because we need to assess newer outputs – i.e.

technologies developed recently, and DNA fingerprinting will help get at that. He agreed that there were lots of baselines at the project level, and impact work does occur at the project level. But, frequently, data is not at the right scale or the sample frame is inappropriate – and, not many surveys go back to the same households. And in relation to NRM, one needs to think a bit more about impact of NRM technologies versus NRM impacts of technologies.

#### **Agenda Item 9. Independent program review**

##### *i. Update on process of ISPC review of CRP-II Call*

*Rachid Serraj*, ISPC Secretariat, [informed the meeting](#) that the pre-proposals for the thirteen phase II CRPs, and 9 Expressions of Interest (IoE) for the four cross-cutting platforms, had been received on 17 August. They had since been reviewed by external experts, ISPC Council members, and ISPC Secretariat staff. They would now be discussed and scored by the full ISPC Council, and commentaries will be compiled on each.

##### *ii. Value for money and associated financial issues for the CRP-II Call*

*Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium Office, gave a [presentation on value for money and other financial issues](#) associated with the CRP-II Call. In the context of declining funding, particularly for Windows 1 and 2, value for money assessments were crucial. Using estimated contributions to the aspirational development targets (SDGs) was one approach, but the data sources, assumptions and calculations used were not clear. It is therefore very difficult to estimate the value for money of any of the pre-proposals. Lessons must be learnt, and the template for the full proposals should require such details to be provided.

The discussion that followed the presentation focussed on the inevitable push towards the delivery end of the discovery to delivery research spectrum if the contribution to mid-term impact was the key indicator of value for money. It was agreed that a balance was necessary to ensure a full pipeline of research outputs at different stages of maturity. The full proposal template would provide the necessary guidance.

#### **Agenda Item 10. ISPC work plan and budget 2016**

*Paul Harding*, ISPC Secretariat consultant, presented the draft ISPC Work Plan and Budget (WP&B) for 2016. The ISPC Task Force Report called for an enhanced ISPC, but this had not yet been approved by the Fund Council. Therefore, the 2016 WP&B consisted of two parts. The first part assumed no change in the mandate of the ISPC, and provided the activities and costs for this. The key activities during 2016 would be the reviews of the CRP-II full proposals, and the Science Forum in Addis Ababa.

The second part assumed that the Task Force recommendations are fully endorsed and begin to be implemented in the second half of 2016. The key additional activities would be strengthening the Council and Secretariat staff, establishing the necessary new networks of experts, and planning the new foresight, quality of science and partnership programmes. It therefore provided half a year's additional activities and costs for such an enhanced ISPC. The full cost of the enhanced ISPC would be seen only from 2017.

Discussions were limited pending the decision of the Fund Council, but participants were generally in favour of a stronger ISPC, reconnected with the science leadership of the CGIAR, and with an enhanced mandate.

#### **Agenda item 11. AOB**

*Maggie Gill*, Chair of the ISPC, mentioned the need to plan the ISPC-13 meeting taking into consideration the timeline for the review of CRP-II full proposals, and the need for dedicating an ISPC closed session for the review. She noted that a likely date for the ISPC meeting is the end of May, but a venue has not yet been selected. Other events to take into account included the Science Forum during the second week of April in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia); and *Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium Office, mentioned that the GCARD-3 meeting will be held in the first half of April, most likely in South Africa.

Before closing the meeting *Gill*, invited all participants to send feedback by email to the ISPC Secretariat on the evaluation of the meeting, pinpointing what has worked well and what has not. She acknowledged the three Council members leaving the ISPC (Jeff Sayer, Takuji Sasaki, and Marcio de Miranda Santos), and thanked them formally for their contributions.

#### **Agenda Item 12. Closing remarks/Adjournment**

*Gill* thanked all participants for their constructive contributions, and thanked FAO for hosting the meeting. She then declared the meeting closed.



10 September 2015

## Agenda

### **12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council 14 - 16 September 2015**

Ethiopia Room, Building C-285, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy

#### **Monday 14th September**

*Arrival of ISPC Council members and participants*

*Afternoon 16.30-18.00: ISPC Council meeting with ISPC Chair (Room C-646)*

*ISPC closed dinner (19:30 – venue Restaurant “Orazio”)*

#### **Tuesday 15th September**

*ISPC Meeting*

09:00

#### **Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting**

- i. Welcome and opening from Prof. Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair
- ii. Welcome and opening from FAO Deputy Director-General, Coordinator for Natural Resources (DDN), Maria Helena Semedo

09:30

#### **Item 2. Reports of CGIAR System Units**

- i. ISPC Chair, *Prof. Maggie Gill*
- ii. Consortium Chief Scientific Officer, *Wayne Powell*
- iii. Fund Office Executive Secretary, *Jonathan Wadsworth*
- iv. Head of IEA, *Rachel Bedouin*

Discussion

- 10:30 *Coffee break*
- 10:50 **Item 3. Strengthening FAO & CGIAR linkages (Maggie Gill)**  
i. *Ren Wang*, FAO Assistant Director-General,  
Department of Agriculture  
ii. FAO's Strategic Objectives Coordinators, CGIAR Focal  
Points and *Karin Nichterlein*, Officer-in-Charge, FAO  
Research and Extension  
iii. *Wayne Powell*, Consortium Chief Scientific Officer
- Discussion
- 12:30 *Lunch break*
- 14:00 **Item 4. ISPC Task Force (draft report) (Maggie Gill)**  
i. Recommendations  
ii. Implications
- Discussion
- 15:30 *Coffee break*
- 15:50 **Item 5. Prioritisation (Maggie Gill)**  
i. Global Futures, *Keith Wiebe*, Senior Research Fellow,  
IFPRI  
ii. Qualitative prioritization framework – preliminary  
analysis (*Timothy Kelley*)
- 17:30 End of Day 1
- 19:00 *Meeting reception and dinner, hosted by the ISPC for all  
participants (Roof Garden Caracalla, FAO)*

## **Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> September**

- 09:00 **Item 6. Strategy and Trends (Maggie Gill)**
- i. Strategic Foresight - ISPC's contribution to foresight analysis vis-à-vis roles of other key players – GFAR (*Robin Bourgeois*), CO (*Marie Gasquet*), IFPRI/PIM (*Keith Wiebe*), ISPC (*Marcio de Miranda Santos*)
  - ii. Update on the study of development corridors (*Rachid Serraj, Jeff Sayer*)
- 10:30 *Coffee break*
- 10:50 **Item 7. Mobilizing science (Marcio de Miranda Santos)**
- i. Partnership study (*Jeroen Dijkman*)
  - ii. Science Forum 2016 planning (*Preet Lidder*)
- Discussion
- 12:30 *Lunch break*
- 14:00 **Item 8. Impact Assessment (Maggie Gill)**
- i. SIAC Program of work update (Doug Gollin, SPIA Chair)
- Discussion
- 15:00 **Item 9. Independent program review (Maggie Gill)**
- i. Update on process of ISPC review of CRP 2nd Call (*Rachid Serraj*)
  - ii. Value for money and associated financial issues for the CRP 2nd Call (*Frank Rijsberman*)
- Discussion
- 15:30 *Coffee break*
- 15:50 **Item 10. ISPC work plan and budget 2016 (Maggie Gill)**
- Discussion
- 16:30 **Item 11. AOB**
- 17:30 **Item 12. Closing remarks/Adjournment (Maggie Gill)**
- (Closed Session ISPC)*
- 18:00 End of Day 2



**List of participants**  
**12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council**  
**15-16 September 2015**  
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy

**ISPC COUNCIL**

**Margaret Evelyn Gill**

Chair, ISPC  
Professor of Integrated Land Use  
University of Aberdeen  
Email: [m.gill@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:m.gill@abdn.ac.uk)

**Segenet Kelemu**

Director General, International Center for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)  
African Insect Science for Food and Health  
E-mail: [skelemu@icipe.org](mailto:skelemu@icipe.org)

**Douglas Gollin**

Chair, SPIA  
Department of International Development, University of Oxford  
Queen Elizabeth House  
Email: [douglas.gollin@qeh.ox.ac.uk](mailto:douglas.gollin@qeh.ox.ac.uk)

**Jeffrey Sayer**

Director, Development Practice Programme  
School of Earth and Environmental Sciences  
James Cook University  
Email: [jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au](mailto:jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au)

**Marcio de Miranda Santos**

Executive Director, Center for Strategic Studies and  
Management of Science, Technology and Innovation  
Email: [mmiranda@cgee.org.br](mailto:mmiranda@cgee.org.br)

**Thomas P. Tomich**

W.K. Kellogg Endowed Chair in Sustainable Food Systems  
Founding Director, UC Davis Agricultural Sustainability Institute (ASI)  
Director, UC Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SAREP)  
Host, Inter-Institutional Network for Food, Agriculture and Sustainability (INFAS)  
Professor of Community Development, Environmental Science & Policy  
Email: [tptomich@ucdavis.edu](mailto:tptomich@ucdavis.edu)

**Takuji Sasaki**

Professor NODAI Research Institute  
Tokyo University of Agriculture  
E-mail: [t5sasaki@nodai.ac.jp](mailto:t5sasaki@nodai.ac.jp)

**SPEAKERS**

**Maria Helena Semedo**

FAO Deputy Director-General  
Coordinator for Natural Resources (DDN)  
Email: [MariaHelena.Semedo@fao.org](mailto:MariaHelena.Semedo@fao.org)

**Ren Wang**

Assistant Director-General  
Department of Agriculture, FAO  
Email: [Ren.Wang@fao.org](mailto:Ren.Wang@fao.org)

**Wayne Powell**

Chief Science Officer  
CGIAR Consortium Office  
Email: [w.powell@cgiar.org](mailto:w.powell@cgiar.org)

**Jonathan Wadsworth**

Fund Office Executive Secretary  
World Bank  
Email: [jwadsworth@worldbank.org](mailto:jwadsworth@worldbank.org)

**Karin Nichterlein**

Officer-in-Charge  
Research and Extension, FAO  
Email: [Karin.Nichterlein@fao.org](mailto:Karin.Nichterlein@fao.org)

**Dominique Burgeon**

FAO Resilience Coordinator  
Email: [Dominique.Burgeon@fao.org](mailto:Dominique.Burgeon@fao.org)

**Clayton Campanhola**

FAO Sustainable Intensification Coordinator  
Email: [Clayton.Campanhola@fao.org](mailto:Clayton.Campanhola@fao.org)

**Keith Wiebe**

Senior Research Fellow  
IFPRI  
Email: [k.wiebe@cgiar.org](mailto:k.wiebe@cgiar.org)

**Robin Bourgeois**

Senior Foresight and Development Policies Expert  
GFAR, FAO  
Email: [Robin.Bourgeois@fao.org](mailto:Robin.Bourgeois@fao.org)

**Marie de Lattre-Gasquet**

Senior Foresight Scientist  
CGIAR Consortium  
Email: [m.delattregasquet@cgiar.org](mailto:m.delattregasquet@cgiar.org)

**Frank Rijsberman**

Chief Executive Officer  
CGIAR Consortium  
Email: [f.rijsberman@cgiar.org](mailto:f.rijsberman@cgiar.org)

**Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin**

Director  
IEA  
Email: [Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org](mailto:Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org)

**Sirkka Immonen**

Senior Evaluation Officer  
IEA  
Email: [Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org](mailto:Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org)

**Doris Soto**

Senior Aquaculture Officer  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department  
FAO  
Email: [doris.soto@fao.org](mailto:doris.soto@fao.org)

**PARTICIPANTS**

**Andrew Noble**

Deputy Director General of Research  
ICARDA  
Email: [A.Noble@cgiar.org](mailto:A.Noble@cgiar.org)

**Richard Thomas**

Program Director, CRP-Dryland Systems  
ICARDA

Email: [R.Thomas@cgiar.org](mailto:R.Thomas@cgiar.org)

**Rodney Cooke**

Board Chair

CIP

Email: [rodneydcooke@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:rodneydcooke@yahoo.co.uk)

**Pierre Pradal**

Director – Internal Audit Unit

CGIAR Consortium

Email: [p.pradal@cgiar.org](mailto:p.pradal@cgiar.org)

**Graham Thiele**

Director – CGIAR Research Program on Roots Tubers and Bananas

CIP

Email: [g.thiele@cgiar.org](mailto:g.thiele@cgiar.org)

**Victor Maurice Kommerell**

Program Manager, CGIAR Research Program on Wheat

CIMMYT

Email: [V.Kommerell@cgiar.org](mailto:V.Kommerell@cgiar.org)

**Jennifer Long**

Senior International Agriculture Research Advisor

USAID

Email: [jlong@usaid.gov](mailto:jlong@usaid.gov)

**Atta-Krah Kwesi**

Director

CGIAR Research Program on Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)

Email: [k.atta-krah@cgiar.org](mailto:k.atta-krah@cgiar.org)

**Ruben Echeverria**

Director General

CIAT

Email: [ruben.echeverria@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:ruben.echeverria@CGIAR.ORG)

**Bernard Hubert**

President of Agropolis International

Agropolis International

Email: [hubert@paca.inra.fr](mailto:hubert@paca.inra.fr)

**Ylva Hillbur**

Deputy Director General for Research

CGIAR Research Program, IITA

Email: [Y.Hillbur@cgiar.org](mailto:Y.Hillbur@cgiar.org)

**Karmen Bennett**

Governance advisor

CGIAR Consortium  
Email: [k.bennett@cgiar.org](mailto:k.bennett@cgiar.org)

**Harold Roy-Macauley**  
Director General  
AfricaRice  
Email: [H.Roy-Macauley@cgiar.org](mailto:H.Roy-Macauley@cgiar.org)

**Charlotte Lusty**  
Genebanks CRP and Crop Trust  
Email: [charlotte.lusty@croptrust.org](mailto:charlotte.lusty@croptrust.org)

**Carlos Sere**  
Senior Advisor on Strategic Partnerships and Global Initiatives  
Bioversity International  
Email: [c.sere@cgiar.org](mailto:c.sere@cgiar.org)

**Eric Witte**  
Senior International Affairs Specialist, Agriculture and Research Policy Office  
Bureau of Food Security, USAID  
Email: [ewitte@usaid.gov](mailto:ewitte@usaid.gov)

**Carmen Thönnissen**  
Senior Advisor  
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA)  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)  
Corporate Domain Global Cooperation  
Global Programme Food Security  
Email: [carmen.thoennissen@eda.admin.ch](mailto:carmen.thoennissen@eda.admin.ch)

**Rodomiرو Ortiz**  
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences  
Email: [rodomiرو.ortiz@slu.se](mailto:rodomiرو.ortiz@slu.se)

**Patrick Webb**  
Tufts University, USA  
Email: [Patrick.Webb@tufts.edu](mailto:Patrick.Webb@tufts.edu)

**Dominique Reeb**  
Senior Forestry Officer, FOE  
FAO  
Email: [Dominique.Reeb@fao.org](mailto:Dominique.Reeb@fao.org)

**Thomas F. Randolph**  
Director  
CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish  
ILRI  
Email: [t.randolph@cgiar.org](mailto:t.randolph@cgiar.org)

**Peter McCornick**

Deputy Director General Research  
IWMI  
Email: [p.mccornick@cgiar.org](mailto:p.mccornick@cgiar.org)

### **ISPC Secretariat**

**Timothy Kelley**  
Officer-in-Charge  
Senior Agricultural Research Officer  
Email: [timothy.kelley@fao.org](mailto:timothy.kelley@fao.org)

**Rachid Serraj**  
Senior Agricultural Research Officer  
Email: [rachid.serraj@fao.org](mailto:rachid.serraj@fao.org)

**Jeroen Dijkman**  
Senior Agricultural Officer  
Email: [Jeroen.Dijkman@fao.org](mailto:Jeroen.Dijkman@fao.org)

**James Stevenson**  
Agricultural Research Officer  
Email: [james.stevenson@fao.org](mailto:james.stevenson@fao.org)

**Preetmoninder Lidder**  
Agricultural Research Officer  
Email: [preetmoninder.lidder@fao.org](mailto:preetmoninder.lidder@fao.org)

**Lakshmi Krishnan**  
Agricultural Research Officer  
Email: [lakshmi.krishnan@fao.org](mailto:lakshmi.krishnan@fao.org)

**Paul Harding**  
Consultant  
Email: [Paul.Harding@fao.org](mailto:Paul.Harding@fao.org)

**Ira Vater**  
Programme Officer, SPIA  
Email: [ira.vater@fao.org](mailto:ira.vater@fao.org)

**Mae C. Maghirang**  
Consultant  
Email: [mae.maghirang@fao.org](mailto:mae.maghirang@fao.org)

**Muriel Pougheon**

Program Assistant/ Administrative Coordinator

Email: [muriel.pougheon@fao.org](mailto:muriel.pougheon@fao.org)

**Galina Iordanova**

Office Assistant

Email: [Galina.Iordanova@fao.org](mailto:Galina.Iordanova@fao.org)