



29 September 2016

End of Meeting report

14th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

14 - 15 September, 2016

ICRISAT Headquarters, Hyderabad, India

Item 1: Opening of the ISPC Meeting

i. Welcome and opening, Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair

Main points:

- Maggie Gill opened the meeting and welcomed participants. She expressed her thanks to ICRISAT for hosting the meeting and for the excellent organization.
- The Council members and other participants introduced themselves.

ii. Welcome, David Bergvinson, ICRISAT Director-General ([Presentation](#))

Main points:

- David Bergvinson welcomed all participants to ICRISAT.
- He gave an overview of ICRISAT's activities and objectives. The focus is on a prosperous and food secure dryland, with an emphasis on the dryland tropics of Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. The structure was traditionally around crops, but has now been changed to focus on three regional programmes – South Asia, West/Central Africa and Eastern/Southern Africa, through partnerships and with a market oriented approach. This is achieved through a holistic approach, working across the agricultural value chain.

Item 2: Updates on CGIAR

i. Update on SMB/SMO, Peter Gardiner, SMO ([Presentation](#))

Main points:

- In 2015 there was a call for simplification to set up one Council and one System Office only. However, during transition, the role of Centers as active observers only was questioned and a change was made en route to create a System Council and a System Management Board with only one office to service both;
- Key features are 1) a central "Trust Fund" (key change - new trust fund starting in 2017); 2) a System Council which is the governing body of the funders (key change – now includes also bilateral funders); 3) a System Management Board which is the decision making body (key change – Center DGs/Board members are voting members); 4) a CGIAR System Organization to support the work (key change - facilitation role with monitoring and reporting aspects);

- This has resulted in the following tasks for the SMO: 1) contributing to an integrated system for performance management (annual WP&B, annual Portfolio review, criteria for prioritization and allocation of unrestricted budget); 2) providing input into system science considerations of the SMB (SRF); 3) monitoring the implementation of decisions arising from system-wide evaluations;
- The transition is now being consolidated. The System Council became active in July 2016, with Juergen Voegele as Chair. The new Executive Director Elwyn Grainger-Jones of the CGIAR System Organisation will take office on 3 October 2016;
- The key SMO functions (science-related) are the Portfolio report (2015 report was published), the Annual report (2015 report in finalization) and contributions to system level gender, CapDev, MELCoP, Open Access-Open Data, IP and site integration (these all continue in 2016).

ii. Update from ISPC since the May Fund Council meeting, Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair ([Presentation](#))

Main points:

- With regards to the CRPs, commentaries were completed on 16 June. On the same day the ISPC interacted with the Science Leaders. CRPs submitted revised proposals on 31 July. On 14 September, in a closed ISPC meeting, the CRPs were rated and assessments were made public. The review of GLDC will be submitted on 16 September together with a strategy paper for SC;
- The SRF (2016 – 2030) calls to strategically build a more coherent and integrated portfolio of second generation CRPs that will collectively deliver System Level Outcomes by partners. This is an excellent opportunity as it leads to an inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary portfolio at a global level;
- Changes in Council and Secretariat: Segenet Kelemu is leaving Council, Holger Meinke, Nighisty Ghezze and Prabhu Pingali are new members. A further Council member is currently being recruited. Tim Kelley is retiring from the Secretariat in September;
- The ISPC is adapting to the new governance – the ISPC Chair in an active observer on both the SMB and the System Council. The ISPC is still waiting for its new Terms of Reference;
- ISPC activities for the future: Quality of science. Foresight, Prioritization, Science of impact and the ISPC Theory of Change.

iii. ICRISAT presentation, *presented by various scientists from ICRISAT*

Main points:

- Organized in the form of a “field visit” around the ICRISAT campus. The visit started with an introduction at the ICRISAT SAT Venture by David Bergvinson (Director General), and included visits to the crop demonstration plots (finger millet, pearl millet, sorghum, pigeonpea, and groundnut); the phenotyping platform; one of the watersheds on campus; polyhouse cultivation for high-value crops; decentralized wastewater treatment unit; disease screening for downy mildew at the greenhouse; and the labs – the ICRISAT Genebank and the Center of Excellence in Genomics. At each of the locations, scientists spoke to the research objectives/approach and outcomes. The visit ended with poster presentations by CGIAR Centers based on ICRISAT campus (CIMMYT, ILRI, IRRI, and IWMI).

Main discussion:

- Questions raised specific to research work showcased.
[ICRISAT website](#)

Item 3: Strategic Foresight

i. Introduction, principles and objectives and ISPC's work on foresight, Prabhu Pingali, ISPC member, Cornell University

Main points:

- It is crucial for the ISPC to engage in foresight, for setting research priorities, and to come to common understanding on the challenges facing the World in 2030-205 and defining the role of the CGIAR in that World;
- There are many foresight initiatives ongoing. But there is a need to look across all studies and key drivers. At the end of the foresight process, conclusions can have different meanings for different organizations, in drawing strategies. When the CGIAR engages in foresight, objective is to gain insight and meaning for the CGIAR;
- We must decide where we can add value for foresight. In addition to the common general drivers and broad categories (e.g. population, income, climate change, etc.), we need to dig deeper into the dynamics and drivers of change; e.g., in 2030-2050 changes in diets in most regions of the World, trends of urbanization and rural transformation, impacts on smallholders agriculture and hinterlands, climate exchange;
- The CGIAR can make a difference by contributing more granular analysis. Need detailed technology forecast, e.g. assessment of new breeding techniques, such as CRISPER. Land and water constraints, in addition to new constraints that will emerge in the future, e.g. phosphates;
- On process, we need an independent group for the initial assessment to provide input for the rest of the process.

ii. Foresight in the CGIAR : Concept Note and Terms of Reference for a Working Group, Albino Maggio, University of Naples ([Presentation](#) and [draft Concept Note](#))

Main points:

- Main objective of the ISPC foresight exercise is to serve as an overall umbrella to: i) Inform the strategy and revision of the SRF; ii) Contribute identifying relevance of CGIAR research; iii) Coordinate streams for better coherence in the CGIAR; iv) Provide relevant context and emerging insights as a basis for system level prioritization of research.

Main discussion:

- GFAR (Harry Palmier): GFAR supports the objectives and process planned by the ISPC for the work on CGIAR foresight. It suggests to contribute to the process by bringing the grassroots perspectives from the regional fora (FARA and others), farmers organizations, civil society and the private sector;
- PIM (Karen Brooks): Welcomes the development of ISPC plans on foresight and highlights some possible risks associated with the activity. Supports the idea of a focused foresight exercise tackling a specific set of questions rather than a general framework. Suggests a three track approach that associates a scanning of what Science can contribute, a standard qualitative assessment (Delphi) with quantitative analysis (modeling). Highlights the need to link the strategic foresight exercise with strategy and trends studies on the model of those previously carried out by the ISPC (farm size & urbanization, Social science etc.);
- ISPC (Maggie Gill): the new System documents (CGIAR Charter and the Framework) have clearly stated that SC is to initiate the strategic foresight exercise with help from the ISPC. Future strategy & trends studies to be conducted by the ISPC have to be clearly associated with/ derive from the overall foresight exercise;

- Additional comments (ISPC Council and others): existence of potential tension between expert-driven foresight vs. user drive; and between global vs. regional scales of analysis. Difficulty in conceptually reconciling long-term foresight activities with donors shifting priorities (short term). Concerns about the difficulty in finding data necessary for trends analysis (e.g. food and nutrition systems). Foresight should use the opportunity to think about innovation and disruptive change, alternative futures. Need to think more carefully about the roles of the private sector in futures of food systems. Role of foresight in prioritization.

Main ISPC follow-up:

- Initiate the process for establishing the Foresight Steering Committee (FSC) in consultation with the SC and SMB and the Foresight Working Group (FWG);
- STAGE 1 to be led by the SC with assistance from the ISPC should be initiated by collating a set of key relevant questions to be addressed in the independent assessment of future trends and key drivers of change (STAGE 2);
- Initiate the independent assessment process by preparing a workshop for launching STAGE 2 as defined above (in collaboration with University of Naples) early in 2017.

Item 4: Quality of Science (QoS)

i: Introduction, Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair ([draft Concept Note](#))

Main points:

- The ISPC, as the major provider of scientific advice to the CGIAR System, is charged with helping ensure QoS in CGIAR research;
- The ISPC Task Force identified the need for System-wide agreement on a set of criteria to define QoS. As a first step in responding to this challenge, the ISPC has called for the establishment of a System-level Working Group on QoS (QoS WG). The overall goal of the QoS WG is to enhance coherence, linkages and coordination between the CGIAR System entities with respect to QoS;
- The key aim of the session is to agree on the Terms of Reference of the QoS WG which include the following 3 questions: (i) What is quality of science in the context of delivery of R4D research results and how does the inclusion of development impact affect the way we should define QoS?; (ii) How we can actually measure this CGIAR-tailored QoS? What are the criteria and methods of assessment?; (iii) How to incorporate and ensure QoS standards throughout the System?, and a time line.

ii: Discussants, short presentations by Holger Meinke, ISPC Member, University of Tasmania; Rachel Bedouin, Head, IEA, and Iain Wright, Deputy Director General, ILRI

Main points:

- QoS and how to measure it is a question of growing importance. Current measurement may be giving perverse incentives: Measuring what we can, rather than what we should. If impact via innovation is the goal, 'science' needs to be evaluated broadly and include the scientists, the program and the organization ([Presentation](#) by Holger Meinke);
- QoS is a necessary, but not sufficient requirement. Do we assess it separate and independently from relevance? QoS essential for credibility. Framework should be able to identify strengths and weaknesses at different stages (ex-ante, implementation, evaluation), and ensure coherence among system entities;

- Data on QoS needs to inform key audiences that QoS is acceptable to develop science-based solutions; accountability and learning; feedback to management to maintain QoS; identification of areas of 'high' QoS;
- QoS: broaden the definition to include relevance, SRF gives some guidance. How will science result in outcomes and incomes. Link to performance management systems. Review other organizations' QoS standards/measures: system fit for purpose to keep movement of staff in and out.

Main discussion:

- QoS also directly linked to quality of staff and educational systems. Needs to be recognizable that scientific enterprises differ, what fits the CGIAR best. Need to take care of possible trade-offs among standards;
- Separating QoS from relevance and efficiency: good science without immediate impact? Mission of the CGIAR Science to have development impact. Funding and funding structure are gate keepers on this, and should support QoS;
- QoS needs to incorporate the manner in which questions are posed and framed. Not just application of appropriate methodology. It also needs to be relevant at different levels: from individual excellence to an organization that delivers societal impact;
- Set of objective criteria to measure QoS, linked to metrics on program reporting for evaluation of the portfolio: different inputs and aspects, account for diversity across fields, points in career: responsible metrics;
- Standardization across the system will be important. Currently rigor applied not equal across the system.

Main ISPC follow-up:

- Expand and revise concept note in light of discussion and issues raised: including refinement of the three questions underlying the QoS exercise;
- Identify and gather information on systems' in use across the CGIAR for the proposed task force in collaboration with the SMO;
- Time line: revision concept note by mid-October 2016. First task force meeting in November. Six months to produce interim report. Detailed timeline will be included in revised concept note.

Item 5: Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)

i: Preliminary findings from the evaluation of the SIAC (2013-2017) project, Julia Compton, Independent Consultant ([Presentation](#))

Main points:

- Overall progress with SIAC has been very good despite a complex administrative structure and a constellation of stakeholders, and that a lot has been achieved with relatively little funding;
- The work on Objective 4 (capacity-building) is less developed than for Objectives 1 – 3 and would benefit from greater attention;
- The quality of science is very good, with the project supported by a team that is working very hard but is almost certainly under-staffed – suggesting that the work program should be organized slightly differently in future;
- The theory of change for the project needs to be revised and updated with a clearer set of assumptions about the role of the information generated, as well as a clearer strategy for how the information will ultimately be used to influence CGIAR decision-making;

- Institutionalizing the regular collection of adoption data is a critical constraint and needs to be thought through more carefully.

Main discussion:

- Maggie Gill noted on the issues of governance for the SIAC project, and SPIA more generally, that there is now an approved “framework document” that can be found on the CGIAR website that should be considered the standard reference;
- Doug Gollin and Tim Kelley thanked Julia for her hard work and penetrating insight, as well as the supporting roles played by Tim Dalton, Sophie Zimm and Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin. SPIA will use the information to shape a proposal for a 2nd phase;
- Peter Gardiner noted his enthusiasm for this work and offered to facilitate SIAC having a day of the CGIAR Science Leaders meeting devoted to planning for impact assessment;
- Keith Wiebe and Julia discussed the link from impact assessment back to priority-setting and modelling. Strong empirical evidence of efficacy should inform assumptions about causal linkages as much as possible. It was noted that this should be a two-way dialogue, so that the perspectives of modelers (regarding what the killer assumptions are in major models) informs the research agenda for impact assessment.

Main ISPC follow-up:

- SPIA Secretariat staff to feedback comments to Julia by 21st September. Julia to finalize the evaluation. James Stevenson to liaise with Peter Gardiner on the offer of a space on the agenda with the science leaders.

ii. Implications of emerging findings from SIAC: understanding diffusion and impact of CGIAR research outputs and plans for a second phase of the SIAC program, Doug Gollin, SPIA Chair, University of Oxford ([Presentation](#) and [SPIA Program Report](#))

Main points:

- Doug Gollin presented progress since ISPC 13 (Lima, May 2016) – the SIAC team have organized three workshops under the project, and participated in three others organized by external partners;
- “The rigor revolution in impact assessment of agricultural research: Implications for the CGIAR” will be a first SIAC synthesis report and was presented as an outline draft, organized under three areas in which rapid progress is being made: valid measurement of adoption and outcomes; tight causal identification; and shifting impact assessment up to a higher level of statistical representativeness;
- Results from work with the World Bank LSMS-ISA team show the importance of DNA fingerprinting for measuring crop varietal adoption accurately, and demonstrate the potential for remote sensing to capture changes in natural resource management practices;
- Areas of potential focus for a 2nd phase of SIAC (2018-2022) were discussed, with a focus on baselines in six high priority countries for the CGIAR (Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda, India, Bangladesh, Vietnam) which together represent over half of the combined 200 million HHs targeted for adoption of improved varieties and management practices.

Main discussion:

- Feedback from the rest of the ISPC was very positive, with broad agreement on the diagnosis of lack of rigor and the specific solutions will continue to be subject to discussion over the coming months;
- Patrick Webb thought SPIA had been correct to not go down the road of focuses exclusively on RCTs – there are a range of approaches that are rigorous – but greater clarity at ISPC level on standards of evidence used in different fields is essential;

- Leslie Lipper, Segenet Kelemu and Tom Tomich all felt that it was important for SPIA to continue to supply the evidence base to donors and to feed findings into prioritization and foresight functions, but noting the tension with other demands made of SPIA (e.g. capacity-building of CG centers; defining indicators for SRF, etc);
- Peter Carberry suggested that SPIA needed to be more critical than collegiate in fulfilling its mandate, noting that the shift to Agri-Food Systems (AFS) CRPs – where innovation may take place somewhere in the value chain and not at farm level – has implications for what SPIA should be thinking about measuring.

Main ISPC follow-up:

- Doug Gollin and Secretariat to continue implementing SIAC Phase 1;
- Doug Gollin and Secretariat to work on relationships with new and existing partners for Phase 2.

Item 6: Prioritization

i. Brief introduction and objectives of the session, Chair, Patrick Webb, ISPC member, Tufts University ([Note on Prioritization Process](#))

Main points:

- Draft terms of reference for the ISPC recognizes that under the new CGIAR System structure the ISPC should lead and advise on prioritization of the portfolio of CGIAR Research programs, drawing on insights from strategic foresight exercises and impact assessments, among other sources;
- This session was organized around a panel discussion with individuals representing different units within the CGIAR;
- The objective was to have a focused discussion on three critical issues that need resolution in order to move ahead on building an effective system-level prioritization protocol, and to identify a set of next steps that can be implemented in 2017. The three issues addressed by the panelists were:
 - 1) What should be included in the system level prioritization system?
 - 2) How should the ongoing CRP level prioritization be considered in system level prioritization?
 - 3) What criteria should be used in the system level prioritization – and how can we move ahead in getting agreement on measuring them?

ii. Panel discussion with individuals representing different units within the CGIAR, Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair; Keith Wiebe, IFPRI - Global Futures; Jonathan Wadsworth, Former Fund Council and Peter Gardiner, SMO ([Presentation](#))

Main points:

- General agreement among the panelists that prioritization should encompass the entire CGIAR portfolio but since W3/bilateral is already set by individual donor investment choices, the major direct outcome of a CGIAR-wide prioritization exercise would be the allocation of W1/W2 funding. Although system level prioritization will also have an indirect effect on W3/bilateral allocations;
- Prioritization is a 'wicked problem', given the divergent and often competing forces at play, e.g., different preferences amongst donors, individual scientists' interests, not to mention the inherent difficulties in trying to maximize marginal returns to CGIAR investments across the many research areas. Prioritization is also about deciding what not to do;

- Initial focus of prioritization should be at CRP level, which could feed into system level prioritization. New and mixed methods are needed, drawing on both past approaches and novel ones. Criteria will include, among others: quality of the proposal, vision (forward looking nature), relevance of targets, complexity of challenges, along with some aspect of 'maturity of research'. There is already a considerable amount of prioritization and foresight activity going on at CRP level, e.g., within the Global Futures Cluster, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. It is a valuable activity in its own right and is helping build capacity within the CGIAR;
- Strategic foresight is a key input into the prioritization exercise; hence the two processes need to be linked and feed into each other. Scale and time frame depends on the user. Quantitative modelling also informs priority setting, but this is not "quantitative priority setting";
- Important to keep the distinction between priorities and goals. Priorities are the activities chosen that will most likely lead to the stated goals, i.e., maximizing achievement of the SLOs. But very important to think that through.

Main discussion:

- The SRF is itself the result of a system level prioritization exercise and subsequent analyses done by the CO/SMO give us an indication of where the current priorities are de-facto, e.g., with histograms showing investments by IDO and sub-IDO level, heat maps, etc.
- Any prioritization framework will have to allow for flexibility, to accommodate big changes in donor investment strategies and to be responsive to new challenges (emerging pests and diseases). At the same time, major shifts (particularly shortfalls) in financial resources is precisely why prioritization is so important – having a clear understanding of those activities that must be preserved at all costs. While priorities can and should be adjusted at lower levels, i.e., within FPs, one would expect higher level priorities to change much less frequently.
- There may be a need to prioritize activities for which there may not be strong capacity or expertise currently in the CGIAR (comparative advantage), but for which the System needs to build capacity for the future. That could also mean de-prioritizing activities that have been successful and re-directing resources to currently weaker areas with perceived high future importance to the CGIAR. How priorities established by individual countries factor into the CGIAR's priority setting framework, e.g., the Science Agenda for Africa, was another important point raised.
- A sharper focus on identifying principles for how activities should be prioritized for considering W1/W2 funding is needed. In addition to generic aspects related to 'quality of the proposal', there are others such as assessing the expected impact on SLOs taking into account probabilities of success, the political economy of priority setting and challenges in reaching agreement amount the 15 centers, e.g., the previous SRF.
- A major concern relates to the need to temper the flow of funds towards bilateralism, and to create more enthusiasm for multilateral funding. Donors on the FEWG could influence that in a major way. But they need to be convinced that their resources will be optimally allocated to achieve highest outcomes if put into unrestricted. Presently, there is a lack of confidence that the System can do that, which is why we see the shift to more W3 and bilateral types of funding. 75% of funding is bilateral, compared to 30-40% some 10 years ago.

Main ISPC follow-up:

- The Chair stressed the importance of the need to focus on principles that can be used for system-level priority setting, and on decision tools, but keeping these pragmatic;

- Specific follow-up actions were not discussed and indeed, pending finalization of ISPC's ToR (expected in February/March 2017) only limited follow-up steps will be taken.

Item 7: AoB and Closing

Main points:

- Exact dates for the next ISPC meeting will be decided and communicated once there is additional information on the System's transition. ISPC15 will most likely be organized during the first quarter of 2017 and held at the FAO premises in Rome, Italy.

Annex 1



14th Meeting of the Independent Science & Partnership Council

12-16 September 2016

Meeting room: C Fred Bentley Conference Center

ICRISAT Headquarters Hyderabad - Patancheru 502324 Telangana, India

Annotated Agenda

ISPC CLOSED MEETING

Board Room 1st floor

Sunday 11th September - 15:00 to 18:00 hrs.

Monday 12th September - 8:30 to 18:00 hrs.
(followed by *ISPC closed dinner*)

Tuesday 13th September - 8:30 to 18:00 hrs.

Wednesday 14th September - 8:30 to 12:30 hrs.

ISPC OPEN MEETING

Wednesday 14th September

14:00 – 14:15

Item 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting

- Welcome and opening by *Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair)*
- Welcome by *David Bergvinson (ICRISAT Director-General)*

- 14:15 – 15:00** **Item 2. Updates on CGIAR**
- Updates ISPC: *Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair)*
 - Update on SMB/SMO: *Peter Gardiner (SMO)*
 - Update from ISPC since May Fund Council meeting: *Maggie Gill*
- 15:00 – 16:00** **ICRISAT Presentation**
- 16:00 – 16:30* *Coffee break and Group photo*
- 16:30 – 18:00** **Cont. ICRISAT Presentation**
- 18:00** **End of first day**
- Dinner hosted by ICRISAT – for all participants (at the Campus)*

Thursday 15th September

- 8:30 – 10:00** **Item 3. Strategic Foresight**
- Introduction, principles and objectives and ISPC's work on foresight: *Prabhu Pingali (ISPC member, Cornell University) - via Confcall*
 - Foresight in the CGIAR : Concept Note and Terms of Reference for a Working Group: *Albino Maggio (University of Naples)*
 - Discussion: Foresight in the CGIAR

The ISPC Task Force recommended that the ISPC play a role in advising the System Council on scientific foresight, to inform updating of the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF). During the governance discussions, it became clear that the ISPC could also play a role in overseeing the implementation of strategic foresight, once the scope has been set by the SC. The foresight exercise will combine independent assessment and analysis of global trends shaping the futures of agricultural research for development.

This session will build on the previous discussions held at the ISPC-14 in Lima, and will specifically introduce the objectives and the process of future ISPC work on strategic foresight. Prabhu Pingali, new ISPC member will introduce the topic and give a brief overview of the principles and objectives of ISPC's work on strategic foresight. Albino Maggio (Consultant, University of Naples) will present a summary of an ISPC concept note on the background and rationale of the foresight work and the initial steps in the process and the program of work. The discussion will seek feedback and suggestions from stakeholders (GFAR, SMO, Global Futures), and participants.

- 10:00 – 10:30* *Coffee break*
- 10:30 – 12:15** **Item 4. Quality of Science (QoS)**
- *Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair)* will introduce the topic
 - Discussants: *Holger Meinke (ISPC member, University of Tasmania), Rachel Bedouin (IEA), Iain Wright (ILRI) - via Confcall*
 - Followed by an open discussion

The ISPC, as the major provider of scientific advice to the CGIAR System, is charged with helping ensure science quality in the CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs).

The ISPC Task Force identified the need for System-wide agreement on a set of criteria to define QoS. As a first step in responding to this challenge, the ISPC has called for the establishment of a System-level Working Group on QoS (QoS WG). The overall goal of the QoS WG is to enhance coherence, linkages and coordination between the CGIAR System entities with respect to quality of science.

The key aim of the session is to agree on the Terms of Reference of the Working Group, which include the following 3 questions:

- 1) What is quality of science in the context of delivery of R4D research results and how does the inclusion of development impact affect the way we should define QoS?
- 2) How we can actually measure this CGIAR-tailored QoS? What are the criteria and methods of assessment?
- 3) How to incorporate and ensure QoS standards throughout the System?

12:15 – 13:30 *Lunch break*

13:30 – 15:15 **Item 5. SPIA**

- Preliminary findings from the evaluation of the SIAC (2013-2017) project: *Julia Compton (Independent Consultant) - Confcall*
- Implications of emerging findings from SIAC: understanding diffusion and impact of CGIAR research outputs and plans for a second phase of the SIAC program: *Doug Gollin, (SPIA Chair, University of Oxford)*
- Discussion: Future Plans for SPIA

The system-level impact assessment activities of the ISPC are carried out by its Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA). For the period 2013 to mid-2017, CGIAR funders have committed substantial additional funding for a program to Strengthen Impact Assessment in the CGIAR (SIAC).

In June 2016, SPIA commissioned an evaluation of the SIAC program, managed by IEA, primarily in order for SPIA to demonstrate its accountability to its own donors, as well as to contribute to a better understanding of SPIA's contribution to the CGIAR. The evaluation will draw lessons and make recommendations that will inform the second (potential) phase of SIAC and, more generally, reflect on future directions of work.

During this session, preliminary findings from the evaluation will be presented and discussed, followed by a presentation of the forthcoming first synthesis report from the SIAC program entitled "The rigor revolution in impact assessment: Implications for the CGIAR" as well as the set of objectives and initial thinking on plans and resources for a proposed second phase of the SIAC program (2018-2022).

15:15 – 15:45 *Coffee break*

15:45 – 17:45 **Item 6. Prioritization**

- *Panel discussion*
Chair: *Patrick Webb*
Panelists: *Maggie Gill (ISPC Chair), Keith Wiebe (IFPRI - Global Futures), Jonathan Wadsworth (Former Fund Council – via Confcall), Peter Gardiner (SMO)*

In late 2014, the ISPC was asked to take the lead across the System in advising and guiding prioritization at the system level. One of the items in the draft terms of reference calls for the ISPC to: lead and advise on prioritization of the portfolio of CGIAR Research programs, based on insights from scientific foresight exercises and impact assessments, among other sources.

The intention of this session is to hold a focused discussion on three critical issues that need resolution in order to move ahead on building an effective system-level prioritization protocol, in order to identify a set of next steps that can be implemented in 2017. The session is organized as a panel discussion, with key CGIAR members discussing three key issues in system-level prioritization:

- 1) What should be included in the system level prioritization system?
- 2) How should the ongoing CRP/Center level prioritization be considered in system level prioritization?
- 3) What criteria should be used in the system level prioritization – and how can we move ahead in getting agreement on measuring them?

17:45 – 18:00

Item 7. AoB and Closing (*Maggie Gill and David Bergvinson*)

18:00

Dinner hosted by the ISPC (Visit to Shilparamam & dinner at Ohris, Hitech city)

Annex 2



**Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council**

ISPC 14 Meeting

organized by the CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council
at **ICRISAT Headquarters**, Patancheru 502324 Telangana
Hyderabad, India

14-15 September 2016

PARTICIPANT LIST

1	Rajesh Agrawal	ICRISAT
2	Jennie Barron	IWMI
3	David Bergvinson	DG-ICRISAT
4	Pooja Bhatnagar	ICRISAT
5	Karen Brooks	PIM-IFPRI
6	Peter Carberry	DDG-Research ICRISAT
7	Jeroen Dijkman	ISPC Secretariat
8	Julia Compton	SPIA-Independent Consultant
9	Ram Dhulipala	ICRISAT
10	Peter Gardiner	CGIAR System Organization Office
11	Pooran Gaur	ICRISAT
12	Nighisty Ghezae	ISPC Council Member
13	Maggie Gill	ISPC Council Chair
14	Douglas Gollin	ISPC Council Member & SPIA Chair
15	Stefania Grando	ICRISAT
16	Joanna Kane-Potaka	ICRISAT
17	Segenet Kelemu	ISPC Council Member
18	Timothy Kelley	ISPC Secretariat
19	Lakshmi Krishnan	ISPC Secretariat
20	Krishna Kumar	Bioversity Int. India
21	S S Sharat Kumar	ICRISAT
22	Preetmoninder Lidder	ISPC Secretariat
23	Leslie Lipper	ISPC Secretariat
24	Albino Maggio	University of Naples
25	Holger Meinke	ISPC Council Member
26	Rodomiro Ortiz	ISPC Council Member
27	Harry Palmier	GFAR
28	Michael Phillips	WorldFish
29	Prahbu Pingali	ISPC Council Member & Cornell Univ.
30	Gupta Rajeev	ICRISAT

31	KV Raju	ICRISAT
32	Abhishek Rathore	ICRISAT
33	Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin	IEA
34	Paco Sereme	ICRISAT Governing Board
35	Rachid Serraj	ISPC Secretariat
36	Kiran K Sharma	ICRISAT
37	Rajan Sharma	ICRISAT
38	Shivali Sharma	ICRISAT
39	Shoba Sivasankar	ICRISAT
40	James Stevenson	ISPC Secretariat
41	Tom Tomich	ISPC Council Member
42	Kumar Tumuluru	CIFOR-FTA
43	Hari Upadhyaya	ICRISAT-Genebank
44	Vincent Vadez	ICRISAT
45	Rajeev Varshney	ICRISAT
46	Ira Vater	ISPC Secretariat
47	Jonathan Wadsworth	Former Fund Council
48	Suhas P Wani	ICRISAT
49	Patrick Webb	ISPC Council Member
50	Anthony Whitbread	ICRISAT
51	Keith Wiebe	Global Futures - IFPRI
52	Iain Wright	ILRI