

## **Proposed format for the ISPC commentaries and review of CRP-II Pre-proposals**

The ISPC will follow the criteria listed in the Guidance document and analyze the proposed evolution of each CRP compared to the first set of proposals both in terms of its individual merit and its contribution to the SRF and the overall system portfolio.

ISPC will use the latest SRF (2016-2025) as a reference. The **prioritization matrix** being developed by the ISPC will be used in the evaluation of pre-proposals first by mapping the different FPs to IDOs, sub-IDOs and the prioritization criteria. This will provide material for the analysis of strategic relevance of FPs and their relative importance in the CGIAR priorities. ISPC guidelines and principles on performance indicators (**results based management**) will be developed for commenting on the use of indicators and units in the CRP-II performance matrix.

### **A. Comments on each specific CRP Pre-proposal (there will be 13 of these in total)**

#### 1. Overall analysis as an integral part of the CRP portfolio

- **Strategic relevance:** is there a compelling argument or sufficient evidence that the CRP as a whole will make a significant contribution to delivery at the CGIAR system level?
- Consideration of the '**grand challenges**', in particular climate change, in appropriate flagship projects;
- Evidence of capturing **inter-CRP synergies** and at the CRP cluster in which the CRP takes part (agri-food system or integrative CRP); In particular,
  - (For 'agri-food-system' CRPs) Does the CRP adopt an integrated approach to advancing productivity, sustainability and resilience?
  - (For integrative CRPs) Does the CRP plan to work with the eight agri-food systems CRPs and how does it conceptualise the integration across the whole portfolio?
- **Rigor and credibility** of the scientific arguments underpinning the rational for the pre-proposal;
- Individual FPs add up to a CRP that offers more value than the sum of individual FPs.
- **Lessons learned** from previous research and earlier external reviews and recommendations have been adequately considered and factored into the pre-proposal.
- **Site integration:** The CRP demonstrates how it intends to work on key site integration plans, i.e., the steps taken and will be taken?

#### 2. Theory of Change and Impact Pathway

- Plausibility of the overall **Theory of Change** of the CRP and its consistency with the SRF;
- Feasibility of **Impact Pathways**
- **Alignment with SRF** IDOs and sub-IDOs; comparison against qualitative prioritization matrix.

### 3. Cross-cutting themes

- Evidence that **gender and youth** issues have been considered within the proposed research framework;
- Recognition of importance of **enabling environment**;
- Commitment to **capacity development** in the CRP overall scope and objectives (Adoption of CapDev Framework)

### 4. Budget

- Extent to which funds requested, relative to the expected outcomes, seems appropriate;
- Balance among **CRP FPs** relative to their expected outcomes.

### 5. Governance and management

- Evidence of leadership and management commitment with an appropriate **governance structure**; arrangements in line with the CRP Governance and Management Review
- Track record of the **Leadership Team**, including FP leaders (recruitment criteria if leaders not in place);
- **CRP partnership strategy**: strategic fit and relevance of partners (has a convincing strategy been applied for selection of partners?); Evidence that partners are engaged and committed to CRP implementation.

## 6. *Criteria at Flagship Level*

### 6.1. Strategic relevance and Theory of Change

- Plausibility of the Theory of Change and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDOs and IDOs; comparison against qualitative prioritization matrix
- Degree of alignment of question or problem to be addressed and expected outputs with national (SDGs) and regional priorities and initiatives (GCARD3);
- Recognition of the need for research to account for potential unintended consequences on SLOs that are not the primary focus of the research.
- Feasibility of the Impact Pathways.

### 6.2. Scientific quality

- Novelty and soundness of the research being proposed;
- Track record of the FP leadership and team, assessed on the basis of what was achieved in the previous CRP portfolio (publications and demonstration of commitment to quality, peer review mechanisms, etc.);
- Lessons learned; evidence of building on previous work (1st round of CRPs); e.g. how things have changed or even been dropped on the basis of past learning.

### 6.3. Comparative advantage

- The FP fills relevant research gaps, and is based on the CGIAR and host center comparative advantage in one or more specified research area

- Strategic fit and relevance of named partners; do the partners included add value in terms of scientific contribution and enhance the probability of impact?

#### 6.4. Cross-cutting issues

- Evidences that gender and youth issues have been considered;
- Recognition of importance of enabling environment;
- Commitment to capacity development.

#### 6.5. Budget

- Extent to which funds requested, relative to the expected outcomes, seems appropriate;

### ***B. Comments on the Expressions of Interest for the coordinating platforms***

The EoIs will be evaluated by ISPC using the selection criteria outlined in the guidance document:

- The excellence and quality of the proposed coordination of Lead Center and partners
- The level of ambition described in the collaboration/network and the commitment of the participants/partners
- Strategy for system wide networking
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation including strategy for strengthening expertise across the system
- Potential impact
- Contribution to establishing and strengthening a durable cooperation between the partners that will contribute to the CRPII Portfolio and the SRF.

### ***C. Comments on the overall portfolio***

- Contribution of each CRP to the SLOs: do CRPs have a clear pathway to the SLOs, have they identified potential barriers and appropriate partnerships both within and external to the CGIAR?
- ISPC will prepare a compilation of all the FPs from all CRPs for overall typology and analysis, using the qualitative prioritization matrix.
- Analysis of CRP linkages: have common sites been identified, geographical foci changed, can we expect synergy in the accomplishment of IDOs/SL-IDOs etc.?
- Progress in the ‘Integrative CRPs’ and linkages with the commodity CRPs and the coordinating platforms.
- Site integration plans: Is there a logical coverage of themes and regions?
- Comments on funding based on the prioritisation matrix;
- Any obvious gaps in the portfolio relative to the CGIAR’s comparative advantages.