



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

11 July 2016

End of Meeting report

13th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

25 - 27 May 2016

Richard L. Sawyer Auditorium

CIP Headquarters, Lima, Peru

Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina, Lima, Peru

Wednesday 25th May

Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

- i. Welcome and opening by Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair*
- ii. Welcome by Barbara Wells, CIP Director-General*

Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair, opened the meeting emphasizing how important it is for the ISPC to have their meetings in CGIAR centers in order to keep connected to the science being carried out in the system. Barbara Wells, Director General of CIP, welcomed the ISPC, the secretariat, donors and observers to the meeting, on behalf of CIP and all the CGIAR centers, noting that the work of the ISPC is critical to the continued success of the CRPs. Barbara stated that she found it impressive that, with all the things going on in the CGAR system right now, there were nonetheless 10 CGIAR centers represented at the meeting.

Item 2. Updates on CGIAR

- i. Update on ISPC*

Maggie Gill gave an update on recent developments within the ISPC, leaving aside the major item of CRP review that has been dominating the time of council members and Secretariat for the past two months. Rodomiro Ortiz, Patrick Webb and Holger Meinke have been welcomed on to the Council in recent months, and the ISPC now has a new Executive Director to lead the Secretariat - Leslie Lipper. The Science Forum in Ethiopia in April – on the subject of “Agricultural Research: Pathways to rural prosperity” was successful, and involved input from a large number of CRPs.

Initial impressions from the CRP reviews suggest that the proposals have improved over time with a common portfolio coming together. The review process for the coming months was explained, in particular that CRPs will be requested to provide addenda or possibly re-written sections, rather than re-writing the entire proposal.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/ispc-update-maggie-gill>

ii. Update on CGIAR Fund

Jonathan Wadsworth presented a detailed overview of the CGIAR Fund since it was established in late 2010. The objectives of the fund were to: i) increase the overall level of funding – something that has certainly been achieved; ii) improve predictability of funding – where unfortunately there has been little progress; iii) provide stability of funding and fund use flexibility – there have been few multi-year agreements completed with donors, though the fund has been able to operate somewhat flexibly; iv) timely disbursements – again, unfortunately not achieved, with many contributions clustered towards year-end and requiring spending within a matter of months; and v) greater proportion as unrestricted funding – unchanged since 2010.

During the lead up to the establishment of the Fund, there had been a wave of enthusiasm for multilateralism towards addressing the Millennium Development Goals, with a push for aid effectiveness. However, this arguably peaked in the mid-2000s and has been in retreat at least since the financial crisis of 2008. There has been a steady increase in earmarking with the CGIAR Fund, which is different to all other Funds with similar donor bases within the World Bank. The same donors are part of the global fund for malaria and others, which have strict no-earmarking rules. The difficulty in achieving donor coordination has undoubtedly had a negative impact on the abilities of scientists to focus on their research.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/brief-history-of-the-cgiar-fund-jonathan-wadsworth>

iii. Update from Consortium Chief Scientific Officer, Wayne Powell (via Webex)

Wayne Powell gave a brief review of ongoing business in the Consortium, covering the compilation of CGIAR reports, technical workshops (including a forthcoming Bellagio conference in November 2016 on genetic resources, policy and synthetic biology), facilitating the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Community of Practice meeting in Rome in December. Wayne acknowledged the CRP submission tool was deficient in some areas, but at least helped provide a template to give some consistency to CRP formats. The Consortium Office recently carried out a data visualization process of the content of the CRP proposals, provided to the ISPC to help facilitate their review. Wayne finished by reflecting on a number of strategic issues for the new portfolio, related to capacity for delivering on the ambitious goals; new private sector partnership opportunities; strategic use of the precious W1 and W2 funding; Capital investment and infrastructure to support a large portfolio; Big Data and integration of the natural, physical and social sciences; and the considerable overlap in goals and participation between the genetic gains and gene banks platforms.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/ongoing-business-new-portfolio-wayne-powell>

Item 3. Research highlights

CIP presentation

Oscar Ortiz, CIP Deputy Director General for Research, gave a comprehensive presentation of the CIP strategic plan 2014-2023, and showed how the three groups of delivery-oriented research (resilient sweet potato; agile potato in Asia; potato seed for Africa) and discovery research (game-changing traits; resilient food systems; conserving diversity) largely mapped on to the Roots, Tubers and Bananas CRP (80% of CIP research). For each strategic area of research, Ortiz outlined the kinds of outputs from CIP research and the research and development outcomes they are aiming towards. CIP has a long tradition in *ex-ante* priority setting, and *ex-post* impact assessment, and this came across in every research area.

Tom Tomich asked how CIP manages to generate and maintain work on big bets / high-risk high-return research and how it maintains these in an uncertain institutional context. Oscar noted that these were grounded in discussions of recalcitrant problems that could not be addressed using conventional means. Late-blight resistant potatoes have only really been established as proof of concept in field trials. Communication about GM is a challenge that has to be got right across all partners in a concerted push. Rodomiro Ortiz asked how much the gene bank is used in breeding, and how priorities for traits are selected? The trait selection is grounded in the RTB priority-setting exercise which focuses on constraints for a number of countries – conducted in a cycle of once every seven years. Regarding the use of the gene bank, broad-based populations are used in screening, and CIP continues to have a pre-breeding project. There is a focus on crop wild relatives, with an attempt to tackle the many issues of linking these up with breeding. There has been spotty use of gene bank, with wild and landrace materials used in some potato varieties.

Patrick Webb asked how climate change projections translate into pest risks, and whether CIP examine these in a cost-benefit framework? Patrick also noted the use of randomized control trials (RCTs) in the evidence base on effectiveness during the presentation and wondered whether there are domains where RCTs are part of the plan for demonstrating impact? Thanasis Petsokas explained that CIP is using the IMPACT model, generating maps of uncertainty regarding climate impacts and now trying to translate that into yield losses. Oscar noted that CIP does not use RCTs as much as it would like as it is costly to do so, though they had a project on the impacts of farmer field schools using that methodology. Marlene Dieckmann (GIZ) noted the impressive figure of 1 million ha of CIP-related varieties, but requested more data on yield impacts, noting that even the recent DIIVA book focuses almost entirely on adoption, rather than estimating yield impacts.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/cip-20142023-strategy-and-the-crps-scar-ortiz>

Peruvian agriculture, presented by Benjamin Quijandría

Presentation focused on unique challenges and opportunities for agriculture in Peru. For instance, a favourable climate all year round that enables export in months where prime exporters don't operate, low productivity in family farms but also limited access to new technologies, etc.

- The focus for INIA is
 - o New varieties for new markets and climates
 - o Environmental friendly for pest and disease control
 - o Post-harvest loss technologies – 30% loss currently
 - o Increase yields in less area and with lower input costs (1.4% to 1.75%)
- INIA also recognizes the importance of enabling environment, given the opposition to GMOs in Peru.
- Discussion touched upon the contrast in productivity and adoption rates for new technologies (Peru has one of the highest rice yields per hectare with 40% of seeds being used certified, but low potato yields, with only 2% of certified seeds); impact of climate change (focus is on monitoring, not adaptation); and the role of livestock in Peruvian economy.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/la-agricultura-en-el-per-benjamin-quijandra>

FTA research highlights, presented by Manuel Guariguata

- Highlights from 55 projects in the FTA database with a focus on LAC countries presented by Guariguata.
- Questions were raised on the outcomes described (improved livelihoods of 10 million people), and the nature of FTA outputs – whether they constitute IPGs, given how contextual some of this work is. On the IPG question, Guariguata responded that outputs have a potential IPG nature – that aspect has to be identified and made available internationally.
- Brief discussion on the new types of outputs from CGIAR research, including information, and how does one go about understanding impacts of such work. In the case of TERRA-I, there is anecdotal evidence of huge impacts – in the Peruvian context, a message goes out to the environmental ministry every time deforestation is detected, and one could analyze the data on institutional responses as well as a before-after of deforestation rates.
- Implications for ISPC work: considering the orientation towards delivery and influence this may have on research activities (more downstream), reflect again on the old ISPC IPG white paper – write a thought piece or update it?

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/forest-trees-and-agroforestry-manuel-guariguata>

RTB research highlights, presented by Graham Thiele

- RTB's work in LAC described, particularly considering the shift in resource focus (an external review in 2007 encouraged CIP to shift resources outside of LAC).

- In general, LAC is a source of germplasm and provides a testing environment (upstream), even if it is not the primary target for CIP/RTB's outputs.
- LAC can also be viewed from the perspective of the global food and agriculture system, and there are good reasons to maintain CGIAR footprint here. For instance, many LAC countries need to prepare for crop diseases (e.g. banana wilt) or respond to climate change impacts (e.g. native potato cultivation has shifted to higher altitudes within a short span of time because of increases in temperature).
- Brief discussion on comparative advantage, as well as the slow varietal turnover rates for potatoes followed. On the latter, one theory is that seed systems are complicated for potato varieties – breeding is trickier, and people as well as the food industry have set preferences.
- Implications for ISPC work: Clearly, there is comparative advantage that derives from regional work, and something foresight and prioritization studies could look at is the direction CGIAR should go in.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/roots-tubers-and-bananas-graham-thiele>

Thursday 26th May

Item 4. Foresight and prioritization

Albino Maggio, University of Naples (via WebEx) presented a synthesis and main findings of the “**JRC foresight study - Global Food Security 2030**”. The main outcomes of the study were:

- By 2030 and beyond, food security will increasingly be considered as securing food supply in response to changing and growing global demand.
- Food security is therefore not only a global and systemic challenge *but also* an opportunity for Europe to play a role in innovation, trade, health, wealth generation and geopolitics.
- Better coordination and coherence at EU level is necessary in order to move from a food security to a food systems approach.

He concluded his presentation with some key messages:

- Policy coherence and coordination is needed between different EU policies to work towards a “food system” approach.
- Clearer recognition that “feeding the world in 2030” will essentially be “feeding the cities”.
- Increased recognition of the crucial role of demand-side dynamics in shaping future food systems.
- In order to build food security solutions from the ground up a culture of innovation in food systems should be promoted.

The ensuing discussion revolved around actual diets, what diets will look like in the future and how different drivers influence future diets. Urban diets are rapidly changing and packaged, processed foods are playing an important role in rural diets (important to note that not all processed foods are junk food). There is a need to think about the relative role of policy to predict changes in demand, not just supply, and in particular about holistic, national policy in relation to the private sector. There will be some

major crops that are managed globally, but meeting demand and supply has to happen locally, regionally and internationally. No country would envision food security internationally versus meeting this nationally, which brings about the role of technology and value judgement about some technologies, for example GM. Often the political position on GMOs is not science or evidence based. There is also a debate about new technologies such as genome editing and if they should be considered GM or not.

Additional issues raised included: defining boundaries of food systems - there are pros and cons of enlarging *versus* restricting the boundaries; the articulation with research and the role of the study in shaping research priorities; and methodology and lessons learnt. The foresight process is more important than the outcome – the objective should be clearly defined at the beginning followed by a thorough process based on the best methodology to answer that question. In addition to trends, shocks and wild cards should also be included in the exercise, in addition to policies that focus on the resilience of the system.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/developing-foresight-capacity-albino-maggio/ISPC-CGIAR/developing-foresight-capacity-albino-maggio>

(cont.) Item 4. Foresight and prioritization

Prioritization of research investments in the CGIAR

Patrick Webb, ISPC Council member introduced the session by explaining that the ISPC has been charged to lead a prioritization exercise to offer guidance to all CGIAR stakeholders on “best bets” for investments across various research streams. This would feed into the next SRF as well as shape the next round of CRPs. He cautioned that it was still early days since the ISPC’s role/responsibility is yet to be defined; and that a possible donor Working Group on prioritization is to be formed.

Jerry Nelson, University of Illinois, introduced the topic “**Quantitative Priority Setting (QPS) for the CGIAR**”. He elaborated on the elements of QPS as well as the proposed methodology, including a common template for technology evaluation and the standardized evaluation of proposed technology. He focused on the use of the IMPACT modeling suite, improvements to the suite needed and concerns about the approach. *Mark Rosegrant*, IFPRI (via Webex) then followed up with a presentation on “**Quantitative Foresight Modeling to Inform the CGIAR Research Program Portfolio**”. He explained that the Global Futures and Strategic Foresight program is a CGIAR initiative led by IFPRI, includes 15 CGIAR Centers and supports the prioritization of research across CRPs as well as within CRPs and Centers. He described some CRP scenarios based on the IMPACT Version 3.2 and concluded with some implications and insights.

In discussion, it was flagged that there is a need to be cognizant of the limits as well as what the assumptions are. Although the IMPACT model is useful for thinking about scenarios, using the results for resource allocation is difficult since research activities are complementary. Moreover, it is not clear how to validate the model (although crop models are relatively easier to validate) or to capture complexity. Accuracy of the data that goes into the model is also questionable sometimes. Time-frames and geographies need to be considered. Another critical issue raised related to the conflict between using the model to set priorities at the system level versus priorities at the Centre level (conflict on giving best estimate). At the moment, there seems to be a complex political economy within the system - it is not clear what the process for changing allocations (from SO and donors) was and if the right criteria were being used. It was agreed that such a quantitative exercise needed to be complemented by a qualitative exercise that takes into account comparative advantage, how trade-offs are addressed, how innovation

occurs and thinking beyond the rate of return on investment. Donors have been asking for priorities for a very long time and it is not an unreasonable demand. Prioritization is very important for answering a fundamental question “What would the CGIAR do with extra funds?” – and evidence is needed to support answering that question. The session concluded with the ISPC Chair emphasizing that it was the start of a process – there are many different tools with corresponding limitations. There is an urgent need for better mutual trust and understanding as well as for showing a unanimous voice to the donors, explaining to them what the opportunities are.

Links to presentations:

<http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/prioritization-patrick-webb>

<http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/quantitative-foresight-modeling-to-inform-the-cgiar-research-program-portfolio-mark-w-rosegrant>

<http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/quantitative-priority-setting-qps-for-the-cgiar-gerald-c-nelson>;

Item 5. Science quality and comparative advantage

i. Key outcomes of the IEA workshop on quality of science (Rachel Bedouin)

Rachel Bedouin, Executive Director, IEA, made a presentation (via WebEx) on “*Assessing Quality of Science in IEA Evaluations- Lessons-learned & considerations for the future*”. She presented the main parameters of quality of science as evaluation criteria, which include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact and sustainability. She also described the IEA QoS Evaluation framework, based on Inputs, management process, and outputs. She then presented a short summary of the outcomes of the IEA Workshop (Rome 10-11 Dec. 2015), which involved representatives of, IEA, ISPC, IDRC, CO, CRP Leader, and evaluation teams.

After describing some of the lessons learned by the IEA and methodological issues related to the complexity of the IEA framework and the use of quantitative and qualitative data, Bedouin presented and IEA revised framework for assessing QoS in evaluations (see PowerPoint). She finally concluded by addressing the following questions for the ISPC:

- Is the framework a good starting point for reaching a common understanding on the various dimensions and aspects of QoS in for CGIAR?
- What are the minimum set of indicators/information when assessing QOS in program appraisal, monitoring, evaluation?
- Does this provide sufficient flexibility for tailoring the approach for these various functions? Further considerations for ISPC

This was followed by discussion of the IEA framework relating QoS to relevance, and various views from systems units and from CRPs. The ISPC Chair concluded that CGIAR donors expect that research should not only be relevant, but also with high quality of science. In addition to relevance of R4D which should lead to impact, research outputs should take into account all those factors and QoS parameters. CRPs need to engage standing scientists and involve teams with different sets of skills.

Next step: topic to be discussed again with Science Leaders in Montpellier, with focus on issues of scientific capacity and infrastructure for CRPs and centers.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/assessing-quality-of-science-in-ia-evaluations-rachel-sauvinetbedouin>

ii. Comparative advantage of CGIAR research (Maggie Gill)

Maggie Gill made a short presentation highlighting the CGIAR core strength in agricultural research, practice and policy, which includes: comparative advantage of IPGs, inter-disciplinarity within one system, globally unique genetic resources, data platforms, spectrum of research from molecules to systems, geographic spread of sites and knowledge base, and trans-national convening power. She noted that the international mandate of the CGIAR gives it a particular comparative advantage in “big data” research, including simulation modelling and impact assessment. Systematic characterization efforts could help to properly understand how to provide benefits to target groups of rural and urban poor and the food insecure through CGIAR research and complementary efforts. Only the CGIAR has the potential to collect a wide range of data globally in a systematic way and then make it available as a global public good. CGIAR provides also important contributions to the global dialogue on poverty and food security. In addition, a global network of germplasm exchange, unique to the CGIAR, continues to identify genes from one environment that might be useful in another environment half way around the world.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/cgiar-comparative-advantage-maggie-gill>

iii. Discussion

Various areas of research and services were highlighted, where the system achieves its highest value, and the need for filling the gaps where private sector or ARIs cannot deliver. For instance the CGIAR is responsible of 93% of germplasm distribution under the treaty. Other advantages include capacity development, and active networks along research pipeline and the impact pathways. There is a need, however, for unpacking the concept of comparative advantage, as it changes over time, and to examine the dynamic value of IPG. The ISPC Chair concluded that future foresight exercises should analyze the global changes outside the CGIAR and see how the system’s comparative advantage is evolving.

Item 6. Partnerships

The session was introduced by *Leslie Lipper*, referring to the ongoing ISPC strategic study on partnership and the previous discussion at the Science Forum 2016. Willem Janssen, Lead Agricultural Economist from the World Bank made a presentation (via WebEx) on “*Science partnerships in international development today*”, where the following topics were discussed:

- The state of science and technology in agriculture
- How agricultural science is changing
- Implications for reorganizing agricultural science: progress and challenges
- The World Bank and agricultural science and technology
- Some examples on partnership approaches
- Evaluating partnerships

Janssen noted that for the World Bank science is a tool and the CGIAR a valued partner. He quoted a recent report from WB “*A renewed urgency, and international and national commitment, is needed to sustain climate-smart agricultural research to deliver needed science based solutions*” (Shaping a Climate-Smart Global Food System, WBG 2015). He also emphasized the need to incorporate technical assistance in productive alliance and other market based approaches, and to strengthen partnerships with the CGIAR and other knowledge providers.

Janssen concluded that partnerships should respond to the need to increase and broaden scientific capacities, also because of new sources of change (e.g. from real to virtual centers of excellence), and address the need to hook up with the development of the sector, to ensure the application of science in problem solving and sustainable progress. The future agenda requires systemic approaches, at the least in the initial analysis, requiring further partnerships.

Finally, he made a few recommendations for strengthening engagement with systems approaches and social sciences, better use of information technology, exploring vertical partnerships (e.g., with Africa’s sub-regional organizations), ensuring that CGIAR centers partner at the invitation of others, investing in the science of delivery (comprehensive risk assessments; selective impact analysis; pilot projects; importance of enabling environment; feasibility of impact pathways); investing in better understanding of some prevalent partnerships such as community driven development, innovation platforms, and consortia; enabling CGIAR members to partner purposefully for development impact. The discussion focused on the evolution and mechanisms of the World Bank’s support to agricultural research and extension, which has been growing over 2014-15, and includes new priority areas on science and technology.

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/science-partnerships-in-international-development-today-willem-janssen>

Friday 27th May

Item 7. Impact assessment

- i. Recent progress in the SIAC Program and options for Phase 2, SPIA Chair, *Doug Gollin (via WebEx)*

DNA finger-printing. What other methods are being considered? Which other methods are also effective? Other methods: Asking farmers; asking experts – range of different methods tested and compared at the same time. For certain crops and certain areas we might be able to do something different than DNA. Also depends on whether seeds systems are functioning and regulated. As yet, we don’t know what is going to work where. Cost of DNA fingerprinting coming down rapidly.

Capacity building role of SPIA? What to do about the paucity of guidance on appropriate methods, e.g. multi-level modelling as well as learning and sharing how to do the various trials in an appropriate manner, and the absence of base lines? Cap dev too far outside the CGIAR will be difficult. Better understanding of methods indeed important; Two schools of thought in IA: need to do carefully designed randomized RCTs – if not, can’t tell the impact. Not necessarily always appropriate for our context, but necessary for credibility. Looking at outcomes for adopters and non-adopters for the impact of technology

is just plainly wrong; SPIA small and can't do it all. Development of methods: cheaper, faster, more reliable methods. Agreement is needed on who is doing what.

Advancing knowledge as an impact pathway – breakthrough in how people use, access – changes behavior, explain what it is. Advancing knowledge as an impact pathway: From an IA point of view, we're looking for an observable change. Change in policy and practice. Not diffusion – Observable outcome measures is the ToC for information products;

How do we make sure that we have a standardized method for reporting against IDOs? A lot of work going on. SPIA happy to be part of the conversation on metrics, costs, what can we measure, what is meaningful to measure?

Is IA at smallholder level appropriate at the moment? How to balance resources for IA with research activities? Reliable information, meaningful and affordable. Expense is clearly something that is kept in mind, but we can't afford not to do IA! Baseline data – no systematic baselines. Never any money for base and end lines; comparisons and controls. Hard to reach conclusions about impact in their absence. Need a system-wide effort to lay down baselines. Judge process of 10-15 years. Need a strategy; Baselines are a system's responsibility. Strong message required; More good IA is needed.

CRPs budget for IA? How will it be funded? Structural impediment – W3: no money allocated to IA; Need for dedicated resources from W1/2 for IA? ISPC to find its way to communicate back to donors. Need to take a lead and get system wide agreement on IA along numerous other issues.

PIA's role is to provide IA public goods: data, roles, methodologies – not to do IA @ CRP level. System for scrutiny of IA: still waiting for its first applicant. How can we incentivize the process? Maybe not voluntary? Responsibility on the CRPs. Is it in the budget?

IA on policy and policy claims? In terms of policy and policy process: looking for contribution – not attribution – tracking observable outcomes is different; For policy: observable outcome is influence – not linked all the way to wellbeing. Contribution – part of the process – need to document; SPIA is working with the LSMS. Wonderful activity. Wonderful data set. But no detailed information about the role of CGIAR technology. Trying to get this included; Two post-docs working with the LSMS process. SPIA work around countries – real scope.

How to capture broader impact of the CGIAR @ IPG level? New tools are required. Qualitative methods. Contribution to a diffuse model. Need good practices, values and good methods;

Link to presentation: <http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/standing-panel-on-impact-assessment-doug-qollin>

Item 8. Mobilizing Science:

i. Main messages from SF16, Tom Tomich (<http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/agricultural-research-for-rural-prosperity-rethinking-the-pathways-tom-tomich-preet-lidder>)

Item 9. AOB

ISPC event calendar (<http://www.slideshare.net/ISPC-CGIAR/ispc-events-calendar>)

16 May 2015

DRAFT Agenda

13th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council 25 - 27 May 2016

Richard L. Sawyer Auditorium
CIP Headquarters, Lima, Peru
Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina, Lima, Peru

Wednesday 25th May

13:00

Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

- i. Welcome and opening by *Maggie Gill*, ISPC Chair
- ii. Welcome by *Barbara Wells*, CIP Director-General

13:15

Item 2. Updates on CGIAR

- i. Update on ISPC, *Maggie Gill*
- ii. Update on CGIAR Fund, *Jonathan Wadsworth*
- iii. Update from Consortium Chief Scientific Officer, *Wayne Powell* -
via WebEx

14:15

Item 3. Research highlights

CIP presentation

15:15

Coffee break

15:45

Discussion on CIP presentation

Invited speaker on Peruvian agriculture, *Benjamín Quijandría*

- 17:00 Regional research highlights:
- i. Forest, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA), *Manuel Guariguata and Jonathan Cornelius*
 - ii. Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB), *Graham Thiele*

18:00 End of first day
&
Dinner hosted by CIP: Peruvian Speciality La Pachamanca

Thursday 26th May

09:00 Update IEA CRP Evaluations, *Rachel Bedouin - via WebEx*

09:30 **Item 4. Foresight and prioritization**

- i. EC 2030 Global Food Security Foresight Analysis: *Albino Maggio, University of Naples - via WebEx*
- ii. Agrimonde Foresight Activities: *Sebastien Treyer (Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations, Paris – France) - via WebEx*
- iii. Discussion: Foresight

The ISPC is expected to be leading (or at least contributing to) the process for developing the CGIAR strategy and Results Framework (SRF), drawing on and synthesizing Centers' foresight reports and other sources of external data and studies. Several actors and institutions, within and outside the CGIAR, are producing foresight analysis and reports related to agricultural R4D, so the role of the ISPC will be to synthesize and draw on such reports through a CGIAR System perspective, and play a 'brokerage' role in CGIAR foresight. During the ISPC-12 meeting (Rome, Sep. 2015), interaction was initiated with three CGIAR actors and partners involved in foresight activities: GFAR (the Forward Thinking Platform, grassroots foresight, collective initiatives), the Consortium Office (CGIAR Foresight Hub), and IFPRI (Global Futures project). This session will describe the work undertaken by French Agrimonde (Sébastien Treyer) and by the European Commission (JRC; Albino Maggio) in developing their foresight analysis: "Scenarios and Challenges for Feeding the World in 2050" or "Global Food Security 2030". The discussion will serve as a basis for considering a similar but more focused effort that spells out key changes ahead likely to impact on CGIAR priorities; and defining the initial steps of a program for future ISPC work on strategic foresight.

11:00 *Coffee break*

11:30 **(cont.) Item 4. Foresight and prioritization**
Prioritization of research investments in the CGIAR

- iv. Issues and approaches to prioritizing research investments in CGIAR, *Jerry Nelson, University of Illinois*

- v. *Using impact model for prioritization: Mark Rosegrant, IFPRI -via Webex*
- vi. Discussion: prioritization

The ISPC has been given the charge to lead a system-level prioritization exercise over the course of the next 18+ months, the results of which would offer guidance and clear recommendations to stakeholders of the CGIAR, particularly donors, about where the highest priority research areas are for the CGIAR, i.e., best bets for investments across various research streams. This would feed directly into the next SRF and help shape the next round of CRPs. It would also assist in donor investment decisions required in the interim, particularly with respect to W1/W2 resources.

Patrick Webb will give a brief overview of how the ISPC is considering approaching this formidable task in drawing on both quantitative modelling techniques and qualitative approaches using best available data and methods that involve a range of stakeholders and experts. An example of the use of quantitative modelling that estimates (approximates) the expected value of research from the CRPs will be presented by Jerry Nelson. Results from this exercise will serve as input into a broader qualitative assessment for considering priorities for CGIAR research. The ISPC would welcome specific suggestions related to methods for priority setting used by other public research organizations and hopes to elicit ideas for the next steps, including how to build a shared vision for setting priorities for the CGIAR.

13:30

Lunch

14:30

Item 5. Science quality and comparative advantage

- i. Key outcomes of quality of science workshop, *Rachel Bedouin – via WebEx*
- ii. Comparative advantage of CGIAR research: *Maggie Gill*
- iii. Discussion

16:00

Item 6. Partnerships

Introduction by Segenet Kelemu

- i. Presentation, *Willem G. Janssen (World Bank) - via WebEx*

Although the understanding of how agricultural innovation takes place is now quite mature, the broad prescription that research and technology needs to be better linked to market and policy changes to allow ideas and solutions to be deployed pervasively, has done little to facilitate the daily decisions of policy makers and practitioners in making innovation and impact happen. The recent ISPC study on Partnership indicated that the CGIAR's ability to contribute to impact needs to be grounded not only in an understanding of how impact occurs, but also on the development and adoption of practices that enable it to actively contribute to it. The development of a framework to aid such understanding, and the creation of the scientific basis to link innovation practice with impact is thus of particular importance to the CGIAR as a science organization. This session will reflect on the policy and practice requirements for the development of a heuristic to explore the causal linkages between innovation processes and impact in current and future agricultural scenarios.

- 17:00 **(cont.) Item 6. Partnerships**
 - ii. Discussion
- 18:00 End of day 2
- 19:30 *Dinner hosted by the ISPC, for all participants, at La Dama Juana, with typical pre-Colombian dances.*

Friday 27th May

- 09:00 **Item 7. Impact assessment**
 - i. Recent progress in the SIAC Program and options for Phase 2, SPIA Chair, *Doug Gollin - via WebEx*
 - ii. Discussion
- 10:30 **Item 8. Mobilizing Science:**
 - i. Main messages from SF16, *Tom Tomich*
 - ii. Next steps
- 11:00 **Item 9. AOB**
 - ISPC event calendar
- 11:15 End of meeting & *Coffee break*

- 11:45 **ISPC closed session**
- 13:00 Lunch
- 17:00 *End of closed session*
- Council free to depart*



List of participants
13th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council
25-27 May 2016

Richard L. Sawyer Auditorium
CIP Headquarters, Lima, Peru

ISPC COUNCIL

Margaret Evelyn Gill

Chair, ISPC
Professor of Integrated Land Use
University of Aberdeen
Email: m.gill@abdn.ac.uk

Douglas Gollin

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

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

Segenet Kelemu

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

Rodomi Ortiz

Faculty [Chair] Professor, Genetics & Plant Breeding
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU)
Department of Plant Breeding
Sundsvagen 14 Box 101
SE 23053 Alnarp, Sweden
E-mail: rodomi.ortiz@slu.se

Patrick Webb

Professor of Nutrition, Friedman School of
Nutrition Science and Policy

Tufts University, USA
E-mail: Patrick.Webb@tufts.edu

SPEAKERS

Jonathan Wadsworth

Fund Office Executive Secretary
World Bank
Email: jwadsworth@worldbank.org

Wayne Powell

Chief Science Officer
CGIAR Consortium Office
Email: w.powell@cgiar.org

Óscar Ortiz

Deputy Director General for Research and Development
International Potato Center (CIP)
Email: o.ortiz@cgiar.org

Benjamín Quijandría Salmón

Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria - INIA
Email: bquijandrias@gmail.com

Manuel Guariguata

CGIAR Forest, Trees and Agroforestry
Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Email: M.Guariguata@cgiar.org

Graham Thiele

Director – CGIAR Research Program on Roots Tubers and Bananas
International Potato Center (CIP)
Email: g.thiele@cgiar.org

Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin

Head
Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA)
Email: Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org

Albino Maggio

University of Naples Federico II
Department of Agriculture and Food Science
Email: almaggio@unina.it

Gerald C. Nelson

University of Illinois
Agricultural and Consumer Economics
Email: nelson.gerald.c@gmail.com

Mark Rosegrant

Director - Environment and Production Technology Division
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: M.ROSEGRANT@CGIAR.ORG

Willem G. Janssen

Lead Agricultural Economist

World Bank

Email: wjanssen@worldbank.org

PARTICIPANTS

Barbara Wells

Director General

International Potato Center (CIP)

Email: b.wells@cgiar.org

James Smith

Director General

International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

Email: J.Smith@cgiar.org

Matthew Morell

Director General

International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)

Email: m.morell@irri.org

Shoba Sivasankar

Director, CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Cereals

Director, CGIAR Research Program on Grain Legumes

International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)

Email: S.Sivasankar@cgiar.org

Marlene Diekmann

GIZ Germany

Email: marlene.diekmann@giz.de

Holger Kirscht

GIZ Germany

Email: holger.kirscht@giz.de

Andrew Jarvis

CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)

International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)

Email: a.jarvis@CGIAR.ORG

Karen Brooks

Director, CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM)

Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Email: K.Brooks@cgiar.org

Marianne Bänziger

Deputy Director General for Research and Partnership

International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)

Email: m.banziger@cgiar.org

Keith Wiebe

Senior Research Fellow

Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: k.wiebe@cgiar.org

Jonathan Cornelius
CGIAR Forest, Trees and Agroforestry
International Center for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)
Email: J.Cornelius@cgiar.org

Marleni Ramírez
Regional Representative, Central South America
Bioersity International
Email: m.ramirez@cgiar.org

Evert Thomas
Associate scientist
Bioersity International
Email: E.Thomas@CGIAR.ORG

ISPC Secretariat

Leslie Lipper
Executive Director
Email: leslie.lipper@fao.org

Timothy Kelley
Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Email: timothy.kelley@fao.org

Rachid Serraj
Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Email: rachid.serraj@fao.org

Jeroen Dijkman
Senior Agricultural Officer
Email: Jeroen.Dijkman@fao.org

James Stevenson
Agricultural Research Officer
Email: james.stevenson@fao.org

Preetmoninder Lidder
Agricultural Research Officer
Email: preetmoninder.lidder@fao.org

Lakshmi Krishnan
Agricultural Research Officer
Email: lakshmi.krishnan@fao.org

M^a Victoria Alemany Martín
Meeting Coordinator
Email: victoria.alemany@fao.org