

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

25-27 March 2013  
CIAT Campus  
Cali, COLOMBIA

### **END OF MEETING REPORT** *(ISPC Secretariat, April 2013)*

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

The ISPC Chair, *Ken Cassman* opened the meeting and welcomed participants. He believed that the meeting was being held at a time when there was a fundamental change in the way the CGIAR was operating. As the new CGIAR started, the Consortium had not been completely implemented, the SC/ISPC was seen as an enforcer of plans rather than as a contributor, but now each of the units was growing to play their appropriate roles in the wider CGIAR and a growing sense of mutual cooperation across entities and programs shows that the reformation is taking hold. He thanked CIAT for hosting the meeting, following on from the productive IDO workshop the day before.

The CIAT Director General, Ruben Echeverria welcomed Council, former colleagues in the Secretariat and observers to the meeting and to CIAT. He noted that he had been able to sketch the work of the Center to the Council in an interaction on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May. He too noted that after 5 years they were involved in the implementation of the new CRPs and he provided a plea to the CGIAR as a whole for continuing cooperative development of the work and to the simplification of processes to the extent possible. CIAT, founded in 1967, had been part of the CGIAR for 45 years and it continued to respond to the challenge of how to feed a growing population with scarce land and water and a fast changing climate. It had done a lot in reinforcing partnerships, and particularly in Africa on CRP development. It currently operates from hubs in Kenya, Vietnam as well as the Colombian headquarters. Its three programmatic areas are on productivity, natural resources and policy, with the bulk of CIAT's impacts coming from collaborative research in five areas: common beans, cassava, tropical forages, rice and capacity building. The Center had been updating the CIAT strategy for 2014-20 which further examined where the Center fits in with partners and the CRPs. There was a conscious engagement with the host country particularly in agriculture for the savannah areas and on climate change, not only with the public sector. Thus CIAT in 2020 aimed to contribute to the CGIAR global programs in Africa, Asia and LAC. Through work in Colombia and other linkages there was the intent to be part of a regional platform for LAC with strong PPP. CIAT was positioning itself to provide science for impact, to understand its shared responsibility for outcomes and was completely committed to playing its role in the new CGIAR.

#### **Agenda Item 2. CIAT in the new CGIAR**

*Elcio Guimaraes*, CIAT's Latin America and Caribbean Regional Coordinator, presented CIAT's strategic vision and approach to agriculture in Latin America. Regarding investment, production and productivity, LAC is very diverse and in some countries investment on agricultural R&D has been going down. Over the years, CIAT's engagement with LAC has been based on its strong technical contributions on beans, cassava, forages and rice. Today, LAC is included in CIAT's strategic research and innovation partnerships, including several CRPs and particularly the CCAFS program. In CIAT's strategy, Central America is a high priority in terms of contribution

to CRPs, with research priorities covering environmental degradation, crop productivity, climate change and eco-efficient production systems. In the Amazon region crop productivity is also a high priority. With the host country, Colombia, addressing environmental degradation and eco-efficient production systems are the highest priorities. Brazil is a strategic partner in research concerning the Amazon but there is also joint research in genetic research and breeding, and Brazil participates in the CGIAR exchange program. Public-private partnerships are an important feature in CIAT's relationship with the host country and Brazil. With Colombia, CIAT is also engaged in the multi-partner innovation networks, such as Agronatura and BioPacífico Park. CIAT's LAC strategy is aimed at creating synergy among CRPs, fostering partnerships for impact and responding to regional demands and challenges.

General program coordinator *Maya Rajasekharan* introduced CIAT's global program and involvement in the CRP portfolio. CIAT is the lead center for the CGIAR program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) and participates in 11 other CRPs, including the support program on genebanks. Its long-standing research on multiple crops and cross-cutting themes in the tropics has facilitated the transition of its contributions from projects to major programs. The four commodities are represented in four of the commodity CRPs (the CRPs-3 series). In GRiSP, CIAT leads work in LAC to address the yield gap and enhance crop management but it is also aiming at transferring lessons from LAC to SS Africa. In the program on Roots, tubers and bananas (RTB) there are synergies to be gained from among the vegetatively propagated crops and CIAT has an integrated strategy with IITA on cassava. In the program on Grain Legumes, CIAT contributes to the comparative genomic analysis and cross-legume database in addition to its work on common bean. In CRP4, on Nutrition and Health, CIAT builds on its earlier research in the HarvestPlus Challenge Program and is engaged in a strategic alliance with EMBRAPA. *Brachiaria* research is strategically aligned with CRPs on Milk, Meat and Fish, Humid Tropics, and CCAFS and a new strategy includes enhancing *Brachiaria* for feed in Africa.. Soils research cuts across four CRPs (Land, Water and Ecosystems, Drylands and Humid Tropic systems, and CCAFS) contributing to a global CGIAR research platform. The goal of sustainability will be a major driving force for improving soil health, restoring degraded landscapes and providing environmental services in Asia, SSA and LAC, and CIAT is a major partner in Humid tropics, including research on sustainable intensification. CIAT's work for linking farmers to markets through value chain analysis and research is part of the CRP on Policies, Institutions and Markets. There are synergies between the CRP on Forests and CCAFS, for instance in the application of monitoring tools that can be applied to forest species. CIAT's research in CCAFS includes leading the theme on adaptation to progressive climate change and CIAT contributes to climate impact modelling, adaptation planning and policy analysis, forage-based strategies, soil carbon assessment and seasonal climate and crop forecasting. Through commitment of its scientific and administrative staff, CIAT is able to adjust to the matrix management that participation in the CRPs requires and works towards common Intermediate Development Outcomes.

### **Agenda item 3. Partnership strategies to meet development objectives: panel discussion**

#### ***i. Introduction.***

The ISPC Chair opened the session by highlighting the changing of role the ISPC has undergone through the CGIAR reform process. The development of CRPs is the fundamental change in the way the new CGIAR is operating and this has also affected the role of ISPC, which should be viewed as a

partner amongst other players and has a specific, independent and constructive role to play in the system. He stated that it was in meetings such as this that ISPC is able to connect with the Centers for feedback and discussions. The progress of the CRPs and the makeup of the meeting illustrate that the reform is taking hold, but we must continue to ask if we are finding and collaborating with the most appropriate partners to have maximum effect and efficiency.

**ii. *Perspectives from the Consortium***

*Frank Rijsberman*, Consortium CEO, highlighted the importance of partnerships in the new CGIAR and that one of the main objectives of the CGIAR reform was to improve partnerships and open up the CGIAR. The first few years of the reform process has focused on setting up CRPs, which may have resulted in a delayed focus on the role and importance of partnerships. He explained that the landscape in the CGIAR in relation to partnerships is variable; GRiSP (for example) has very effective partnerships, and is setting the global agenda with research on a global scale. He suggested that not all CRP partnerships are as effective, and therefore the Consortium has conducted a stakeholder perception survey to develop a baseline and better understand how the CGIAR is working with partners. He also informed participants that the Independent Evaluation Arrangement will provide an external evaluation to share best practices on how to develop strong management and governance of the CRPs. As the Consortium is now an independent entity, it is also exploring partnership arrangements that were not possible before; this includes a partnership with the African Union, in addition to memoranda of understanding signed with four French organizations who sought an umbrella agreement with the CGIAR as a whole instead of bilateral agreements. The Consortium and CGIAR will need to better engage and strengthen partnerships in some key countries such as Brazil and China, and the Consortium can help broker some of those agreements. In response to a question from Jean Luc Restrepo of the Colombian national program if there was an easy and direct method to engage with CRPs, and to better understand the opportunities for engagement. Rijsberman agreed the need to have easily accessible information for potential partners to find contact points and developments for CRPs.

**iii. *CGIAR Communities of Practice – example of Generation Challenge Program (GCP)***

David Hoisington presented the GCP as an example of good partnerships in the last 10 years. He explained that GCP sought to connect groups of crop researchers, mainly breeders, to share experiences, information, tools, best practices and improved varieties. The Challenge Program conducted case studies and assisted in enhancing and supporting capacity building efforts. Now that CGIAR support of the GCP is coming to an end, the information and opportunity for partnerships is channeled through an information portal and Integrated Breeding Platform (<https://www.integratedbreeding.net/com/org>) which focuses on hosted crop communities as well as community building and interaction facilities. This has resulted in the CGIAR taking a step back and allowing a community of practice to take ownership in the form of a stakeholders platform.

**iv. *Opportunities for partnership with advanced research institutions (JIRCAS)***

*Osamu Koyama*, Director of research strategy at JIRCAS, explained that Japan used to be one of the largest donors to the CGIAR, however this is no longer the case. He explained that JIRCAS has a budget of USD 40 million with 110 scientists working on collaborative research in developing countries. *Koyama* explained that in the past, conventional bilateral collaborations were isolated, however collaboration through the GRiSP CRP has created a supporting mechanism at the country-level that deals with rice research. Therefore, JIRCAS is now part of both the CRP and the national committee, which has allowed a broader and more organized partnership. This provides an incentive

for collaboration, and an opportunity for linking global issues and national policies. Scientific researchers understand their role better as they are part of a global system, with linkages to international issues and impact, which has in turn enhanced the global scale exchange of scientific knowledge. *Koyama* also highlighted that scientist exchange is as important as financial support in building partnerships, as it helps researchers to feel part of a global system. He emphasized that CRPs are able to generate synergy effects when there are common goals, common strategy and common partners, and hence can accelerate global utilization of local public goods.

v. ***GFAR perspective on partnerships within the new CGIAR***

*Mark Holderness*, the GFAR Executive Secretary, presented GFAR and its role within the CGIAR. He explained that GFAR is a partnership which includes CGIAR, and the Forum acts as both a catalyst and a mechanism for partnerships in agricultural research broadly. *Holderness* stated that there is an underestimate of the value of CGIAR reform in changing national systems, which has led to a transformation of how we work. GFAR conducted a large process of collective thinking two years ago, whereby 2,000 people reviewed the needed change and envisioned the role of research in the future. He stated that the world economies are changing with new economic players; there is emergence of capabilities in countries such as Thailand, Mexico, Brazil, and China. He explained the need to reframe the way of thinking away from production alone, as India is on paper, food secure, but still has 40% child stunting. He suggested that there is a need to think how the CGIAR and research can help national systems to deal with these changes and help farmers manage risk, which opens up a lot of dimensions for partnerships. He further noted that investment remains one of the main issues, as a key challenge is who will receive funds for the work that needs to be carried out. Partners have yet to see the value of the CGIAR transformation and CRP development in helping to leverage funds to work on the uptake, capacity building, skills, and training.

vi. ***A national program perspective (Corpoica, Colombia)***

*Juan Lucas Restrepo*, Executive Director of Corpoica gave a presentation via Skype on the current program and work in Colombia with focus on areas of further future engagement with the CGIAR. He explained that the new government in Colombia tasked Corpoica to develop a strategy for agriculture and innovation. Their main finding was that in many cases research was fragmented, there were duplication of efforts, and financing from ministries was incomplete with a short-term perspective, leading to lack of collaboration. In addition, linkage with international research and development was almost non-existent. Corpoica developed a strategy to assist in the Ministry of Agriculture in developing a national agenda. This included collaboration with producer associations, universities and research centers. It also included the development of a knowledge platform ([www.siembra.gov.co](http://www.siembra.gov.co)). He explained that Corpoica is working with 14 research centers in Colombia and established seven innovation networks. In terms of partnerships, he emphasized the need to invest in CRPs (such as the Roots Tubers and Bananas) to facilitate knowledge and increase efficiencies and impact. He suggested it was difficult to understand how to engage and invest with the CGIAR system as a whole, and not merely CRPs led by CIAT.

The discussion focused on new partnership efforts, and the role of ISPC. Donors noted that strengthening partnerships is very important and is also the most challenging aspect of the new CGIAR. Restrepo of Corpoica added that there needs to be a shift of thinking from “how can we work together” to “how can we accomplish things together”. He also stated that there are opportunities to link to national systems, which need to be further explored. CIAT Director General highlighted that the new CGIAR, and the CRPs, have made possible new and more effective levels of partnerships.

## **Agenda item 4. CGIAR progress update**

### ***i. Report from the ISPC Chair***

The Chair of the ISPC updated participants on the current activities and program of the ISPC. He informed the participants that the next big event for the ISPC in 2013 is the Science Forum to be held in September in Bonn entitled “*Nutrition and Health Outcomes, targets for Agricultural Research*”. The Forum aims to explore where agriculture can make a difference in nutrition and health impacts. ISPC has a strong partner for the organization and implementation of SF2013 in the BMZ Germany.. This is a continuing tradition for ISPC as former Forum partners with the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS), held in Beijing. Papers from the 2011 Forum are soon to be published in a special issue of the journal PNAS. Cassman also provided an update on the Foresight Studies implemented by ISPC which look at emerging issues, and explained that in 2012 ISPC produced a paper on prioritization which provided a theoretical framework for the system and CRPs through developing intermediate development outcomes (IDOs). He also brought to participants’ attention the September 2012 workshop on conservation agriculture which examined the state of scientific knowledge and evidence associated with this set of approaches, which had resulted in 16 papers under review for publication in a special issue journal. Cassman also announced an upcoming paper on SLO Linkages was being developed which will be discussed at the Fund Council meeting in New Delhi in April. Future efforts being led by ISPC which he believed would also be valuable contributions to the development of the SRF and future CGIAR practice included (1) studies on the implications and trends in farm size and urbanization (this meeting); and (2) studies of biotechnology research in CGIAR and on metrics. In terms of Program Review, Cassman noted that this has slowed with the near completion of the initial CRP portfolio, however there has been efforts in reviewing the Drylands CRP. Cassman also noted with pleasure, the the appointment a new ISPC Council Member Takuji Sasaki, who had joined the Council March 2013 and who would attend the next ISPC Meeting in September.

### ***ii. Report from the Fund Office***

*Johnathan Wardsworth*, Executive Secretary of the Fund Office provided an overview of the budget and status of funds of the Fund Council. In 2012, the total budget was USD 505 million, with a carry-over of USD 132.8 million from 2011. He also discussed the overview budget of the system units (i.e. the Consortium Office, The Fund Office, IEA and ISPC. Wadsworth explained that currently five donors are representing 52% of total funds, and that many different donors prefer the different funding windows. For example, Window 3 funding presents a bilateral funding channel to Centers, and if included would bring the total budget up from 505 million to 850 million. In 2013, the request for Window 1 and 2 funding was forecast as USD368million and the contribution to system costs (the budgets of the system entities) was calculated to be approximately 1.8%. However, as recovery from bilateral sources is still not optimal (roughly 0.55%) it has been recommended to keep the 2% CSP rate for 2013.

Participants inquired whether there was any opportunity to formally track funding that is provided to partners. Wardsworth explained that tracking partner funds was more difficult as funding for partners usually goes through bilateral agreements, which is at one remove from Fund Council systems. However, the figure provided for bilateral funding to Window 3, is Fund Council funding and is therefore tracked by the system where current estimates indicate that partner funding is approximately at 30%.

### ***iii. Report from Consortium Office***

*Frank Rijsberman*, the Consortium CEO, presented the latest update from the Consortium on the CGIAR reform. He explained that the Consortium Office is working as one team with the ISPC with key priorities of (1) making CRPs a focused set of 16 programs that are an attractive investment portfolio with clear outcomes; (2) fulfilling partnership promise; and (3) improving governance and managing risks. He stated that there is a need to increase capacity to address these 3 priorities, and the Consortium is working on addressing these needs directly. He further stated that throughout the CGIAR and beyond there is now an acceptance of the reform and an understanding of the benefits, with focus on how best to make it work. He announced that the 2012 SRF Action Plan had been strongly endorsed... Rijsberman then presented the plan for the upcoming years, and stated that their work plan for 2013 includes focusing on defining outcomes and designing a performance management system; while 2014 will focus on developing and evaluating the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of CRP proposals for the 2015-17 funding cycle. He explained that there are issues with the 2011 SRF which need to be addressed, including the need to provide for a 20 year outlook, and to identify metrics for monitoring. Rijsberman explained that the 2012 plans included (1) a governance review in June 2013, (2) building up capacity in the Consortium Office beyond the current leadership team to include mid-level professionals; (3) further developing and strengthening the OCS (One Common System); (4) focus on new partnership development, and, (5) developing a new capacity strengthening action plan.

Discussion with participants focused on the need to ensure the OCS was a solid system, as there were high interest and stakes in ensuring it works well. Participants also asked about the high transaction costs of reporting and the plans for evaluation and EPMRs. Rijsberman explained that the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase for proposals will address some of these issues, as well as the upcoming presentation by Rachel Bedouin of the Independent Evaluation Agreement (IEA).

### ***iv. Report from the Head of IEA***

*Rachel Bedouin*, Director of the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) presented to the participants the plans and overview of the new office for evaluation. She explained that the CRP life cycle includes evaluation as a component of the overall monitoring, impact assessment, and evaluation of the CRP, and is a part of a common framework. Bedouin further explained that “impact assessment” is conducted towards the end of cycle (led by SPIA), while “monitoring” is conducted led by the Consortium. In this cycle, she explained, evaluation plays an important, integral, role in the monitoring – evaluation – impact assessment cycle. Bedouin then introduced the participants to the new unit, IEA, which was established in late 2012 to conduct quality evaluations and develop mutually reinforcing and harmonized evaluations within the CGIAR in order to meet accountability requirements, support decision-making and contribute to institutional learning. She also stated that the IEA aims to develop a CGIAR wide community of practice on evaluation (Evaluation CoP). The 2013 workplan for IEA includes (1) assessment of CRP M&E plans, resources (staff and budget), challenges and issues, (2) survey of CRP evaluation focal points, (3) consultation with CRP for the preparation of comprehensive, four-year rolling workplan of evaluations, as well as (4) first workshop to establish ECoP in October 2013. For 2013, Bedouin announced that IEA would be conducting an evaluation of “Forests, Trees and Agro-Forestry” (CRP6); conducting a review of the governance and management of CRPs; while starting preparatory work for CRP evaluations to be carried out in 2014.

Discussion with participants focused on finding methods to harmonize evaluations and provide information on evaluations. Bedouin explained that IEA aims to be pragmatic in terms of timing and

cycle of evaluations, to ensure it is staggered. She also highlighted that the evaluation function is a major effort to influence reform on where funding is going as well as provide an independent assessment of CRP development and progress.

## **Agenda item 5. ISPC contributions to the SRF Action Plan**

### *i. Farm Size Dynamics and Urbanization Study*

ISPC member *Doug Gollin* introduced the topic as one of the key studies that the ISPC had undertaken to provide up to date information to the CGIAR Consortium as it develops a new strategic framework document for the CGIAR. Will Masters of Tufts University has been the lead consultant on this ISPC foresight study which seeks to examine the ways in which major trends and issues linked to changes in farm/herd/flock size and the increasing importance of urbanization in the developing world, particularly in Sub-Sahara Africa and South Asia, are likely to influence the design and prioritization of agricultural research within the CGIAR.

Through a Skype and PowerPoint presentation, Masters summarized the key elements of a synthesis document he had circulated earlier. The synthesis document drew on three key inputs: (i) five ISPC commissioned papers summarizing the issues and trends on data on farm size and urbanization from Tom Reardon (Asia), Thomas Jayne (Sub-Sahara Africa), Agnes Andersen-Djurfedlt and Magnus Jirstom (geography & demographics), Cees de Haan (livestock) and Peter Hazell (cross-cutting); (ii) deliberations by some 20 experts on these topics during a two-day workshop in January hosted by Tufts university; and (iii) Master's own analyses and integrative assessment of the salient issues. The draft synthesis had benefited from comments from many of the workshop participants.

A major conclusion emerging from this study is that global agriculture is becoming increasingly diverse, along two main axes. The first axis is the degree of commercialization: stretching from the highly dynamic (commercialized) to the hinterland (isolated) zones. The focus here is on transport costs and the large differences for input use and role of agribusiness. The second axis relates to resource ownership: family vs. investor-owned farms. Farm size is tailored to family enterprise for most crops, despite scale economies in processing and marketing. Family-size farms vary in area/worker and mechanization but demography drives trends in *average* area/worker. This results in considerable heterogeneity both within and across geographies. A major conclusion and key implication for the CGIAR is that its research should be increasingly tailored to diversity and change in commercialization and resource ownership as well as diversity and change in agro-ecological conditions. Rather than being a question of either/or, the CGIAR can and should drive productivity growth in both dynamic and hinterland areas to achieve poverty reduction, nutrition improvement and environmental sustainability, taking into account the specific needs and opportunities of households in each region and impacts on the broader community (e.g., lower food prices through large gains in productivity in more favoured dynamic zones). With respect to farm size, the implications are that most Asian farmers will seek labor-saving innovations, whereas most African farmers will seek to increase labor/hectare.

Masters concluded his presentation by emphasizing the need for "Big data" projects with high spatial resolution and rich data structures for both targeting and evaluation, e.g., to measure commercialization and resource ownership, and to capture rapid expansion of dynamic zones and technological innovation. This would facilitate a CGIAR strategy which more effectively targets and measures the impact of its work focused on the world's remaining hinterland, resource-poor

farmers, while at the same time fostering the growing areas of dynamic but still low-income farmers.

ISPC member Rashid Hassan first thanked Masters for an impressive analysis and presentation and then invited comments from the group. There were a number of questions by ISPC members and observers related to specific data and figures presented in the analyses, e.g., on increasing meat consumption in poor countries, demand trends for starch and staples, income trends. The basis and analysis for these trends are found in the background review papers which are available on the ISPC website. In response to a question about geographic focus, the Chair of the ISPC indicated that, from the beginning, the intention was to keep the focus on the primary target regions of the CGIAR – SSA and South Asia – however he acknowledged that the lessons learned from the LAC experience would be very useful here. Other points raised related to the need to give more priority to food safety – given increasing urbanization – a point also raised in the January workshop. Much of the discussion centered on the issue of hinterlands and the realistic potential for improving agriculture and thereby well being in those zones. It is not simply a case of investing in roads to convert hinterlands to dynamic zones. Low agricultural potential is another factor to consider. While non-farm development strategies are clearly a priority for those zones, they may be insufficient in themselves and thus farming will continue to be important for those households in the future, hence a role for the CGIAR. Others questioned this strategy and wondered whether a useful distinction should not be made between hinterlands with high agro-ecological potential and those with low, and with the latter thinking about an exit from agriculture strategy. Other points raised in an extensive discussion session included, for example, the cultural aspects of farming, and particularly the gender component that seemed to be missing, the issue of seasonal migration to dynamic zones, the scope for development corridors for mining as a way to open up the hinterlands. In closing, Rashid Hassan thanked Masters for a thorough and compelling analysis and looked forward to receiving the final version of the Synthesis document which the ISPC would make available to the CGIAR at large.

## **ii. Initial report on ISPC-sponsored study on SLO linkages: implications for research prioritization and resource allocation**

ISPC member *Maggie Gill* introduced the topic by reporting outcomes from an ISPC sponsored workshop held in Rome 11-12 March which was organized for preparing the ISPC White paper on SLO impact pathways and linkages. The paper had been requested by the Fund Council and the Consortium as a consideration towards setting research pathways towards the achievement of the system's goals, and to examine the interactions between addressing each of the separate SLOs individually and to consider prioritization of effort. The workshop had focused specifically at the System-level and identification of Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDO) for the System as opposed to developing CRP-level IDOs that is a task of a specific CRP working group.

Dr. Peter Hazell who facilitated the Rome workshop joint the meeting virtually and presented the major issues and conclusions emerging from the discussions and four background papers prepared for the Rome workshop. Two central aspects in developing the ISPC White Paper include development of System-level IDOs (SL-IDOs) at an appropriate stage along the impact pathway from research to the SLOs, and how the linkages between the SLOs influence the impact pathway analysis and IDO design. The IDOs need to serve as proxies for the SLOs but they also need to capture the linkages among the SLOs, both positive and negative. They need to



be defined at suitable scales. Some IDOs are best determined at national level where the CGIAR also invests in nationally-oriented policy research that influences outcomes.

There are many pathways (or theories of change) for achieving the SLOs, even within the subset of pathways that rely on agricultural R&D. The CRPs are developing impact pathways relevant to their own thrusts but at the aggregate level robust impact pathways for SLOs do not exist that would apply across programs. Impact pathways to the SLOs, for instance reducing poverty, are complex and context specific, and thus research planning similarly needs to be context specific. Aggregation of outcomes from different research paths at the System-level is difficult because of this context-specificity.

The best candidates for system-level IDOs (SL-IDOs) are those that are common to several R&D impact pathways and necessary for the achievement of an SLO... Identification of IDO clusters across CRPs would be helpful to come up with a larger range of common and necessary outcomes. For instance, for nutrition (SLO3), increasing the range of nutritionally rich foods available to households can be seen as a necessary but not sufficient outcome for realizing improvements in diets, and hence it would make a useful system level IDO. Within adopting regions, IDOs for poverty could include increased productivity, wages, off-farm opportunities and lower food prices; these may have indirect effects outside the adopting regions, such as lower food prices, economic growth and migration opportunities.

There are many powerful linkages among the SLOs, many of them negative. For example, intensifying systems may have negative environmental effects; focus on staples and caloric supply may divert effort from nutritional value and diverse food supply. Agricultural research can also disadvantage the poor if, for instance, benefits are captured by others than those targeted or where outcomes may work against employment etc.. There are assumptions that work on one SLO may have indirect effects on other SLOs; for instance, that improving resource sustainability will contribute to poverty reduction - but these are not backed by sufficient evidence. The linkages need to be anticipated in planning and to be reflected in the IDOs. Clearly a relatively wide range of indicators are needed both at the CRP and the SLO level. At system level there is need to capture the full range of impacts across the portfolio blending policy with technology and addressing spatial reach. For instance, for poverty and food security the best integrated scale is country where both the negative and positive effects can be captured. The interface with policy, government and activities of other agencies is at country level. However, for NRM other scales, ecoregion, watershed or specific adopting regions, may be optimal.

Dr. Hazell's presentation was appreciated for having helped to clarify the issues. In the discussion, it was emphasised that how research contributes to development impacts is more complex than may have been anticipated and, generally, it is not easy to find simple solutions to the questions of how best to achieve the SLOs. Giving clear advice for System-level priority setting and management is thus challenging. Caution is needed in selecting measurable things that may be simple tools for management. Context specificity makes generalisable interpretations difficult. Scale of targeting and measurement is important and depending on scale the linkages between, for example, natural resources and poverty may change. Economic growth is very important and we may have underestimated its role in accelerating development pathways, or even of changing directions and opportunities for change through agriculture. More work is clearly needed on the impact pathways but it is probably useful only at the CRP level. It

was pointed out that a very large proportion of the change at the SL-IDO level has nothing to do with the CGIAR's agricultural research, and we should be honest when this is the case.

*Jonathan Wadsworth* from the Fund Office emphasised how important it is to work on as appropriate a set of the IDOs as possible for planning purposes and for tackling the negative trade-offs. Green house gas (GHG) emission is one big item within the NRM agenda and important to the donors. GHG emissions are an important externality to work on poverty, food security and nutrition agenda which for donors are the primary entry points. Yet, capturing the trade-offs is possible through monitoring GHG per unit of production and suitable data can be collected at the CRP level.

There is a common thread for discussing IDOs at the CRP level and in relation to individual CRP activities where there is a strong sense of legitimacy in the context of countries. The case for System-level IDO was considered less clear as at the System level there is substantial complexity in finding causal links. Trying to uncover models that underly the System level IDOs may give a very incomplete and untrue picture. It is likely that the causal links could be enumerated more carefully with more research, but robust and generic impact pathway likely would not be found. There is, therefore, the need to accept the complexity and understand better the relationships of the context factors and conditions under which specific impact pathways function. Pathways to nutrition seem best understood (if difficult to achieve) but the other SLOs are different.

The discussion noted that the national level created a definable unit for an outcome that make sense also to others within a country than the government; NGOs and civil movement and other relevant partners whom it is also important to involve. National level may be one way of controlling the transaction costs for linking with multiple partners. Yet, other scales, importantly sub-national levels, are needed for revealing some trade-offs and analysis and assessment of the issues may be possible only at more local contexts. While country level is persuasive for three of the SLOs, for environmental outcomes the scales at which changes manifest themselves will be the unit of assessment. Thus the "adopting region" as a unit will vary. Scales and linkages can be considered a wicked problem. It will be challenging to aggregate at larger scales and accumulation of data at higher levels would require a lot of effort.

Part of the iterative process, including research, will entail making observations at local levels and inferences at higher level. The ISPC Chair concluded that the ISPC's role is to bring to the donors the best evidence and analysis to see clearly through things that are complex by nature and issues for which there are no simple answers. He noted the discussion had been helpful in allowing us to conclude on what we know about SLOs and IDOs, and would allow the ISPC to bring the paper together as a synthesis on what we think is doable for the system.

#### **Agenda item 6. Strategy and trends (Metrics to support CRP development and monitoring)**

The ISPC Chair introduced the session on metrics a follow-up foresight study on the recommendations of the Science Forum (Beijing, 2011). *Rachid Serraj* of the ISPC secretariat presented a draft concept note for a strategic study on metrics and benchmarking to support CRP monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He presented a matrix of potential metrics across a range of outcome categories, and scales (from household and plot to region). Following on the recommendations of SF 2011, the focus of the study will be on the science underlying measurement questions. A system of common metrics will serve three main purposes: i) to measure changes in agricultural productivity across scales and to monitor associated impacts on

environment, livelihoods and ecosystems; ii) to assess causal linkages and tradeoffs among IDOs and SLOs from adoption of new technologies and systems approaches (e.g. sustainable intensification); and iii) to inform the CGIAR and donors about success (adoption & impact), or lack thereof, towards IDOs and impact (SLOs); i.e., the need for comparability and common understanding that allows assessment of the CGIAR portfolio and to report in a CRP-specific and aggregated manner at the system level.

Several examples on metrics and monitoring systems from within CGIAR were highlighted, the Village Dynamics in South Asia (VDSA) system led by ICRISAT and IRRI; Harvest Choice; the recent CCAFS baseline surveys, and the work planned by the Water Land and Ecosystems CRP (WLE) on the development of agro-ecosystem health metrics and measurement protocols at the scale of CGIAR mandate regions, with highest priority given to the data-poor regions in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. Further work on metrics is also planned as part the new SIAC project carried out by SPIA. In addition, there are a number of international institutes, partners and donors collecting metrics and indicator data at different spatio-temporal scales and for different purposes. Therefore, opportunities for linking with national systems and other actors to build datasets of metrics need to be explored in the strategic review.

Most key initiatives in data monitoring and metrics systems relevant to the CGIAR mandate have been recently reviewed (<http://wle.cgiar.org/blog/2012/11/22/dfid-commission-review> ). The DFID-commissioned report concluded that one of the main constraints is that many of the initiatives they reviewed lacked a conceptual framework. It also recommended an explicit approach of using uncertainty bounds on all metrics for linking measurements with decisions. The current ISPC initiative will build on the analysis made and the lessons learned in the review and the available literature to carry out a strategic study on metrics, benchmarking, and monitoring for CRP evaluation and impact assessment.

A specific proposal was presented on the way forward for the metrics and monitoring strategic review, which include the following steps:

- i) inventory:
  - purpose of metrics/indicators in the CRPs
  - planned use of metrics/indicators by CRPs
  - metrics/indicators measured outside the CGIAR
- ii) identify gaps in having suitable metrics and indicators for CRP- and System-level IDOs;
- iii) identify where CGIAR has comparative advantage for research to fill these gaps; identify other research organizations with expertise to fill other critical gaps;
- iv) strengthen the communities of practice (CoP) for the science that underpins relevant metrics for the CGIAR.

In discussion, ISPC Council members noted the need to link the metrics CoP with key partners outside the CGIAR, who are recording some of these metrics data. There was a question about long-term maintenance of databases and metrics vs. short-term approaches, sometimes with surveys that are done in a single time period, highlighting the importance of institutional commitment for long-term initiatives and the need to invest in longitudinal datasets. Extensive amounts of data collected outside the CGIAR could be potentially used for its purposes. But there is a need to identify through surveys, what the gaps are in available datasets, taking into

account data quality aspects. There was a mention of possible institutional problems in data collection due to context-specific challenges. It was suggested that analysis of institutional commitment could be an important component of the review, which would be easy to assess at the Center level with the physical and soft infrastructure, but may be evolving significantly over time in the CRPs.

The matrix presented for the metrics study was found useful as it provides a possible framework for developing sets of CRP-specific metrics, across the impact pathway and geographic scales. The SPIA Chair indicated that analysis of return on investment somewhat fits in SPIA's mandate but would be outside the scope for this study. As methods of data collection are changing very rapidly, with the new ICT competencies to collect data in all manner of ways. For example, World Bank staff claim that, due to spread of conditional cash transfers, within 5 years it will be possible to identify the name and address of every poor person in the world. It was suggested to keep the focus of the study on a 5 to 10 year's timeline to assess what kind of new metrics should be developed next. The ISPC Chair emphasized the need for science analyzing the rate at which indicators change over timescales.

Observers considered the strategic study by the ISPC could be useful and timely, not only for CRPs but also for other users such as IEA, SPIA and various donors. The GFAR representative welcomed the study and suggested that gender disaggregation should be considered all the way to intra-household livelihoods and risk measures. He also stressed the importance of partnership beyond research (extension, input markets etc), and the need to work beyond single institutions toward networked solutions. Several CRP representatives confirmed their commitment to participate in the study and emphasized the need for a system-wide dialogue on metrics to better identify the needs and focus on the gaps that need to be filled at the system level.

The ISPC Chair expressed appreciation of the discussion He summarized the way forward for the study as to first compile and analyze the metrics and indicators planned to be used by the CRPs, analysis of gaps on data and metrics, bringing external expertise for assisting in developing metrics methodologies, and finally convening a workshop for completing and fine-tuning the outcomes of the study.

#### **Agenda item 7. Summary of IDO Workshop and the way ahead on the SRF Action Plan.**

Patrick Dugan presented a summary of the joint ISPC/CRP workshop on IDOs held 24<sup>th</sup> March. He updated the ISPC on the progress made by the CRP working group on developing IDOs at the CRP level, including a set of common and discreet IDOs that, in the aggregate, could represent the System level. The IDOs were developed to reflect potential outcomes in relation to a 9-year framework. These top down outcome targets would require that CRPs developed explicit impact pathways and theories of change towards achieving them. The CRP working group was recommending that the optimal level for IDOs was that they were constructed at the level of direct benefits. In addition, some IDOs that would describe program efforts to create an "enabling environment" for change were also considered. The measurement of achievement will be strongest at the adoption level and more difficult to show cause and effect at higher levels. Targets should be specified by site, commodity and beneficiary group. Poverty focus and gender dimensions were considered important and dedicated IDOs for gender might be needed. Considering the number of IDOs, the group saw a need for a common set of IDOs, about 10,

with same measurable outcome across the CRPs that could be aggregated, and some CRP-specific IDOs.

## **Agenda item 8. New studies, support to the CGIAR**

### ***i. Biotechnology***

*Rachid Serraj* from the ISPC Secretariat presented an update on the ISPC strategic study on biotechnology, which is part of the ISPC's Work plan & budget for 2013. The study is designed to address three major objectives: i) to assess the delivery pipeline from biotechnology research in the CGIAR exploring to what extent and in what kind of time frame the research is resulting in improved technologies or improved efficiencies in research; ii) to analyze how CRPs should position themselves strategically in internal partnerships and with outside partners to achieve maximum synergy and efficiency in biotechnology research; and iii) to provide scenarios regarding near- and mid- term developments in biotechnology research, research application and constraints to adoption that will influence investment choices in the CGIAR. To-date, a group of focal points from Centers/CRPs has been set up for their engagement in the study design and implementation.

The study was well received by the meeting as highly relevant and timely. Several important issues about the overall scope and focus of the study were raised. Observers from several commodity CRPs considered the need for a strategic study quite urgent. There was a discussion of focusing the study on a few topics only; the most important ones being crop genomics, including bioinformatics, GMOs in crops and livestock (vaccine development). The need for a forward looking study was emphasized by several observers and the ISPC was advised against doing a cost/benefit study on the fast moving technologies.

Most CGIAR Centers conduct genomics research routinely in integration with crop improvement activities. While genotyping and sequencing technologies are advancing very quickly, major challenges exist in bioinformatics, data analysis and phenotyping. Research on GMOs is also being done at nearly all the Centers, but this research has quite a different set of issues, for instance related to product development and delivery (stewardships and liability) and policy. Policy and institutional issues were considered very important and deserving proper focus in the study. The participants from the Consortium Office suggested that ISPC should try to include both the genomics and GMOs study components, to provide an assessment of the CGIAR's comparative advantage from the System's perspective and advice on CGIAR future strategic investments in biotechnology. This could be a good opportunity for the ISPC to have a position on GMOs and engage the major audiences to avoid future discord. Subsequently the issues of directing funding to biotechnology research could be discussed with more transparency. The GFAR representative welcomed the study but cautioned against prescribing what the national research systems should do regarding GMOs. Observers also advised that the study should keep its focus on the areas where CGIAR has a comparative advantage and assess the strategic partnerships required for better synergy and complementarities. With fast moving technologies, prediction of best strategic position for the future, regarding for instance outsourcing, costing and targeting is difficult. One additional issue is the long-term nature of the research and factoring in the time dimension in the planned 9 year delivery cycle. Subsequently the CGIAR needs to decide to what extent it engages in the basic aspects of research rather than developing and delivering the products for farming.

The ISPC Chair expressed appreciation for the lively discussion and helpful comments for moving ahead with the study.

*ii. ISPC presentation of portfolio of potential topics for future strategy and trends, and/or foresight studies*

The ISPC Chair opened the discussion on potential topics for future strategic studies. The list of potential topics had been developed in earlier ISPC discussions. Two topics - related to analysis of boundary organization and innovation platforms - were assessed as being better addressed by others than the ISPC. The ISPC would adopt a watching brief and would consider whether they could usefully add to Consortium efforts on innovation platforms in the future.

Regarding irrigation in SSA, the technologies and partners are evolving. Alternative technologies are becoming available for irrigation in Africa and costs on engineering studies have come down. Private sector companies have become interested in SSA and dealing with small-farmers in these issues. Several studies on the potential of irrigation in SSA have been recently conducted, including a study led by IFPRI using a combined biophysical and socioeconomic approach. It has confirmed that the potential for irrigation investments in Africa is highly dependent upon geographic, hydrologic, agronomic, and economic factors, which all need to be taken into account when assessing the long-term viability and sustainability of irrigation projects. The study also found significant profitable irrigation potential for both small-scale and large-scale systems and concluded that regional analysis can guide distribution of investment funds across countries to be complemented by in-depth country and local-level assessment of irrigation potential, for agricultural and economic development in Africa. However, as discussed in previous ISPC meetings, this topic did not receive support as a priority for ISPC studies.

Other topics suggested related to new emerging technologies, such as nanotechnology, and to food and energy prices, as earlier arguments were not valid anymore given rapid developments in energy pricing. Thus a fresh look could be justified. It was felt that advice is also needed in areas where high profile political assumptions may start driving public funding even though, in some cases, the attention may not be founded on an adequate science base such as low-carbon development, diverting funds to climate change mitigation in agriculture and research on waste. The current policy discourse on the subject of “climate smart agriculture” is not science-based and an analysis by the ISPC would therefore be timely. A scientific assessment of evidence and needs could help to make sure that new allocations go to the most important issues.

Two additional topics received significant support at the meeting, IT and talent. Information technology encompasses a number of important issues. The tools themselves, such as cell-phones and internet are becoming very common and this has changed certain research dramatically. The topic is forward looking and strategic from the CRP’s perspective. It would need to deal with sources of data, new systems for generating data, decentralization of data collection, interpretation and diagnostic tools and, importantly, data analysis. The study could include both getting products to farmers and the impact on and interactions among scientists upstream. There would be a need to explore the frontiers and synergies regarding what the CGIAR needs and what the comparative advantages are. There are examples (climate change) of building farmer capacity to do their own monitoring. The need for field experimentation would diminish if good quality data with lots of data points could be made available from farmers. This allows researchers to do much more. It was suggested that IT revolution may be bigger than the

genomics revolution; the issues are not so much about the technology as about how to use it. Also satellite technology may revolutionize research for looking at global agendas.

A donor observer supported the study on IT, particularly as it benefits research; how the system can use IT to improve the quality of research; dealing with “big data” and ability to reach rural areas, for instance in Africa. It was concluded that with such a potentially huge breadth of scope and to avoid overselling a widely considered area, that it would be important to identify the CGIAR-wide issues and most useful intersections of global and system requirements, and that these may also include issues of access and equity rather than just the technological frontier. Looking at new partnerships for IT would be very relevant.

Attracting best scientific talent is crucial for the CGIAR’s future. There have been surveys, a very recent one on staffing. The issue also broader; how does the system bring the best minds to research, engage talent along the impact pathway and prepare for future skills needs. This is also relevant for NARS. The ISPC Chair undertook to keep the dialogue open on future studies open through the next ISPC Meeting and he thanked CRP colleagues and observers for their inputs.

### **Agenda item 9. Report of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA)**

*Doug Gollin*, Chair of the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment, gave a comprehensive overview of SPIA’s work program. A number of SPIA studies are in their final stages: the Diffusion and Impact of Improved Varieties in Africa (DIIVA) project; four poverty-focused competitively commissioned studies; a cross-cutting legume impacts study; and two cases highlighting the contribution of Germplasm Collection Conservation Characterisation and Evaluation (GCCCE) to crop germplasm improvement. Early results from DIIVA and the legume study were presented, and an progress report for the other studies were presented.

For DIIVA, the priority is now on finalizing the global dataset in a way that is comparable across centers, ensuring it is internally consistent, and then publishing it on the Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators (ASTI) website. The three impact case-studies from the project are to be sent out for external review in May. There will be two green-cover reports on DIIVA published in July – a synthesis report by Tom Walker, lead consultant for DIIVA, and a second report with all the three impact case-studies. In addition, a 20-chapter book with all the details on the crops covered in the project is being produced and will published by the end of 2013. Negotiations with publishers are ongoing.

The four poverty-focused studies (led by CIMMYT, WorldFish, IRRI and IFPRI) are all due to be completed by the end of June 2013. These will be externally peer-reviewed, with a SPIA introduction putting them in context of the challenges of reporting on SLO 1 in the new CGIAR system. The legumes impact study features two surveys in India on chickpea in different states (one led by ICRISAT, another by NCAP) which are due in June 2013. These will put alongside other studies consolidated by SPIA into a single final overview report to be written by Tim Dalton in July / August 2013. Consultants Jonathan Robinson and CS Srinivasan submitted revised versions of the CIP and CIAT case study reports in November 2012 and these are now final and will be posted to the <http://impact.cgiar.org> website with a commentary from SPIA.

Further details of all these studies that are in their final stages are available in the SPIA Activities Update document at: <http://impact.cgiar.org/SPIAmeetings>

Starting in January 2013, SPIA has embarked on a major new program of Strengthening Impact Assessment in the CGIAR (SIAC), thanks to new funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates

Foundation and with other contributions from other donors (notably DFID) that are expected over the coming months. Gollin outlined the four objectives of the SIAC program as follows - Experiment with new methods for estimating adoption; Institutionalize the collection of adoption data; Assess impact of under-evaluated areas of CGIAR research; and build a community of practice on impact assessment – before highlighting examples of the kinds of activities that will be implemented towards meeting these objectives.

There was a lively discussion in response to the presentation. Several CRP representatives offered useful insights and suggestions for the work on experimenting with new methods for estimating adoption of varieties, natural resource management techniques, and the influence of policy research. Karen Brooks emphasized the importance of adoption data in monitoring progress of the CRPs, reinforcing the objective of institutionalizing this process as soon as possible. Rachel Bedouin highlighted the value she gets from being part of the Project Steering Committee for SIAC and stressed the gains to be had for both evaluation and impact assessment from close collaboration as well as consultation with CRPs. Bedouin emphasized the importance of setting priorities clearly to ensure the output from SIAC is as relevant as possible.

The ISPC Chair cautioned SPIA on aiming for perfection on data quality, reinforcing the importance of wide coverage of adoption estimates across research areas as a benchmark for monitoring change over time. Mark Holderness made a number of points in support of activities in SIAC that will build the community of practice on impact assessment, as well as offering to provide specific input in the area of monitoring behavioural / institutional / attitudinal change measures. Andy Jarvis of CIAT urged SPIA to make results available in a form that is consistent with Consortium expectations to ensure the process of feedback into priority-setting across and within CRPs can happen effectively.

In response, the SPIA Chair addressed the immediate comments and welcomed further input. The concept of theories of change for CRPs as the basis for a causal framework on how we expect research to have impact will help guide SPIA in defining where and what to measure. Gollin noted that it is difficult to establish causality rigorously in such complex settings but that the objective of trying to do so is the right one.

The issue of how to fit findings back into the learning agenda of the CGIAR is one that SPIA will take seriously. The goal is to contribute evidence of what kinds of development outcomes the CGIAR is doing well in delivering on, and the areas where it is performing less well. SPIA wants to produce results that meet the needs of accountability but he gave the example of the National Bureau for Economic Research (NBER) which does very careful analysis of policy-relevant issues but stops short of making explicit policy recommendations. SPIA will provide inputs to a decision-making process at the levels of the Fund Council and at the Consortium.

#### **Agenda item 10. Report on the 2013 Science Forum**

*Maggie Gill*, ISPC member and Chair of the 2013 Science Forum 2013 presented an update on the 2013 Science Forum on *Nutrition and health outcomes: targets for agricultural research*. She announced that the 2013 Science Forum is being hosted in partnership with GIZ Germany, in Bonn Germany (23-25 September) which is a comparatively low cost venue for the CGIAR. . Gill explained that the Science Forum has a strong and diverse steering committee and seeks to address emerging issues to assist the Consortium and CRPs to plan their scientific agenda. The Forum will be made up of six plenary and 10 breakout groups and will include a knowledge share fair of electronic and digital posters.. The Forum will also include a plenary session for early career scientists to highlight innovative work in the agriculture and nutrition area. Gill explained that



participants are being asked to complete an application and expressions of interest, which will allow the ISPC to monitor the balance of external and CGAIR scientists at the Forum. She also stated that, as in previous Science Forums, papers are expected to be published in a special edition peer-reviewed journal.

The discussion included the need to extend reach through a communication strategy, which will be explored by the ISPC. Participants noted that there are many layers of this topic, such as intra-household issues on nutrition. There will also be a need to explore food preparation – as the process of making agricultural produce into food has a nutritional impact. Participants also pointed out that nutritionists in developed world have a clinical approach, whereas developing countries have a more public health perspective. In short, the expectation was that the Science Forum would be playing an important role in bringing some of these several perspectives together and trying to tease out the evidence base for the CGIAR's contributions to SLO3 in the context of wider efforts.

#### **Agenda item 11. Any Other Business**

The Chair thanked all the participants to the meeting for what he judged to be a very constructive and useful meeting for the ISPC. He again expressed his thanks to the CIAT DG and staff for their organization and hospitality and for contributing to the positive atmosphere in which the meeting had been held. He invited participants to the next ISPC meeting which would take place at IWMI Headquarters, Colombo, Sri Lanka from the 9th to the 11th of September 2013. There being no further business, the meeting was closed.

Draft Agenda

7th Meeting of the Independent Science Partnership Council

25-27 March 2013

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical

International Center for Tropical Agriculture  
(CIAT)

CIAT Headquarters, Cali, Colombia

\*\*\*\*\*

Friday 22nd March

Arrival of ISPC Members

\*\*\*\*\*

**Saturday 23rd March**

*Morning: Arrival of ISPC Members*

*Lunch (CIATs Main Restaurant)*

CIAT Presentation Program: A GLANCE AT CIATs RESEARCH

(Nariño Conference Room)

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| 14:00 | Welcome – Wanda Collins, CIAT Board Chair<br>Overview of CIAT – Ruben Echeverria, Director General                                    |
| 14:20 | 'Driving discovery, development and delivery for an Eco-Efficient<br>Agriculture – Joe Tohme, Agrobiodiversity Research Area Director |
| 14:50 | New Global Soils Strategy – Deborah Bossio, Soils Research Area<br>Director   |
| 15:20 | Decision and Policy Analysis (DAPA) – Andy Jarvis, DAPA<br>Research Area Director   |
| 15:50 | CIAT Today: A retrospective – Albin Hubscher, Deputy Director<br>General – Corporate Services   |
| 16:10 | Coffee break  |
| 16:30 | Visit to the Gene Bank – Daniel Debouck, Project Manager of<br>Genetic Resources  |

- 17:15 Visit to the Transformation Platform – Beata Dedicova,  
Transgenic Specialist
- 18:00 APERITIFS AT THE SAMPER ROOM
- 18:30 ISPC Dinner in Cali at “Ringlete Restaurant” A taste of Colombia  
Departing at 18:30 from the Hotel Reception

**Sunday 24th March**

- 08:30-17:00 Closed session: ISPC-CRP leaders workshop on CRP Theories of  
Change, Impact Pathways, and IDOs (agenda to follow later as  
developed in consultation with the Consortium and the CRP  
leadership team)
- 18:00 Welcome Cocktail and dinner hosted by CIAT

**Monday 25th March**

- 09:00 ISPC Closed Session
- 12:00 Lunch
- 14:00 1. Opening of the ISPC Meeting
- i. Welcome and opening from ISPC Chair: Ken Cassman
- ii. Welcome and opening from the CIAT DG: Ruben Echeverría
- 14:30 2. CIAT in the new CGIAR
- i. CIAT and its approach to agriculture in Latin America. Elcio  
Guimaraes, Latin America and the Caribbean Regional  
Coordinator (14:30hrs)
- ii. CIAT’s global program and involvement with the CRP  
portfolio (CRP7, CRP5, CRP1.2, etc). Maya Rajasekharan,  
Office Director General Program Coordinator (14:45hrs)
- iii. Discussion (15:00hrs)
- 15:30 Coffee break
- 16:00 3. Partnership strategies to meet development objectives:  
Panel discussion (5-7 minutes per speaker)
- i. Introduction by the ISPC Chair
- ii. Perspectives from the Consortium following the IDO  
workshop
- iii. CGIAR Communities of Practice – the example of the  
Generation Challenge Program (Dave Hoisington)
- iv. Opportunities for partnership with advanced research  
institutions—example from JIRCAS (Osamu Koyama)
- v. GFAR perspective on partnerships within the new CGIAR  
(Mark Holderness)
- vi. A national program perspective – from Colombia (Juan Lucas  
Restrepo, Executive Director of Corpoica)

Open discussion on all of the above to identify possible assistance that might be provided by the ISPC

Welcome Cocktail and dinner hosted by the ISPC

**Tuesday 26th March**

- 09:00 4. CGIAR progress update
- i. Report from the ISPC Chair (Ken Cassman) (9:00 hrs)
  - ii. Report from the Fund Office Executive Secretary (Jonathan Wadsworth) (9:20 hrs)
  - iii. Report from Consortium CEO (Frank Rijsberman) – including the progress with the action plan for the SRF (9:40 hrs)
  - iv. Report from the Head of IEA (Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin): “Evaluation in the reformed CGIAR” (10:00hrs)
- Discussion of CGIAR progress reports (10:20)
- 10:40 Coffee break
- 11:00 5. ISPC contributions to the SRF Action Plan
- i. Report on preliminary outputs from the ISPC-sponsored study: Influence of Trends in Farm Size and Urbanization on CGIAR Research Priorities” (Will Masters, by Skype, Study Leader, Tufts University) (Chaired by Rashid Hassan) (11:15hrs)
- Discussion
- ii. Initial report on ISPC-sponsored study on SLO linkages: implications for research prioritization and resource allocation (Peter Hazell by Skype) (Chaired by Maggie Gill) (12:00hrs)
- Discussion
- 12:45 Lunch
- 14:00 6. Strategy and Trends (metrics to support CRP development and monitoring)
- i. ISPC plans for study and workshop on metrics, benchmarking, and monitoring for CRP evaluation and impact assessment (Rachid Serraj) (Chaired by Ken Cassman) (14:00hrs)
  - ii. Discussion with CRPs on sentinel sites, indicators and metrics (15:00hrs)
- 15:15 Coffee
- 15:45 7. Summary of IDO Workshop and the way ahead on the SRF Action Plan and beyond.

### **Wednesday 27th March**

- 09:00 8. New studies, support to the CGIAR
- i. Biotechnology (Rachid Serraj) (09:00hrs)
  - ii. ISPC presentation of portfolio of potential topics for future strategy and trends, and/or foresight studies, plus open discussion to help prioritize among these options (Ken Cassman) (09:30hrs)
- 10:30 Coffee break
- 11:00 9. Report of SPIA on Impact Assessment in the CGIAR
- i. Progress in the development of the SIAC workplan (Doug Gollin)
  - ii. Finalization of studies from 2012:
    - DIIVA
    - Legume study
    - Poverty study
    - Others
- 12:30 Lunch
- 14:00 10. Report on the 2013 Science Forum
- i. Update from 2013 SF Organizing Committee (Maggie Gill) (14:00hrs)
- 15:00 11. Any Other Business
- 16:00 End of session
- ISPC Members free to depart

### 24 March: ISPC Meeting with CRP Leaders on CRP IDOs

Time	Agenda item	Description	Responsible
08:30	Opening session	Introduction to the issues, timelines, challenges and opportunities	Ken Cassman, ISPC— Frank Rijsberman Consortium—
09:30	Progress, lessons and issues surfaced in constructing CRP IDOs	Plenary presentation; questions of clarification	CRP IDO Design Team
10:00	Synthesis of ISPC comments on the utility of IDOs as developed by CRPs	Plenary presentation; questions of clarification	Peter Gardiner ISPC
10:30	Coffee		
11:00	Group discussion	Around questions to be developed previously (by ISPC analysis and by the CRP IDO working group) and confirmed during coffee	Facilitator
11:45	Group presentations and plenary discussion		Facilitator
12:30	Lunch		
14:00	What are the implications for the CRPs of adopting IDOs	Group work on the following areas*: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proxies for impact and timescales</li> <li>• Distinguishing pathways to impact on the different SLOs and refining theories of change</li> <li>• Partnerships</li> <li>• Putting dimensions to IDOs</li> </ul>	
15:30	Coffee		
16:00	Group presentations and plenary discussion		
17:00	Next steps and wrap up		



**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**ISPC 7th Meeting**

CIAT, Cali, Colombia  
From 25th to 27th March 2013

**Independent Science and Partnership Council of the CGIAR**

1. **Kenneth Cassman**  
Chair, ISPC and Heuermann Professor of Agronomy  
University of Nebraska, Lincoln  
United States of America  
Tel. +1 402-472-5554  
Email: [kcassman1@unl.edu](mailto:kcassman1@unl.edu)
  
2. **Margaret Gill**  
Professor of Integrated Land Use  
University of Aberdeen  
14B/10 Riversdale Crescent  
Edimburg EH12 5Qt  
United Kingdom  
Tel. +44 770 31 31 373  
Email: [m.gill@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:m.gill@abdn.ac.uk)
  
3. **Jeff Sayer**  
Director, Development Practice Programme  
School of Earth and Environmental Sciences  
James Cook University  
PO Box 6811, Cairns  
N. Queensland 4870  
Australia  
Tel. +61 74-042-1663  
Email: [jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au](mailto:jeffrey.sayer@jcu.edu.au)
  
4. **Marcio de Miranda Santos**  
Executive Director, Center for Strategic Studies and  
Management of Science, Technology and Innovation  
Tel. +55 61-342-49-601/11  
Fax. +55 61-342-49-660  
Email: [mmiranda@cgee.org.br](mailto:mmiranda@cgee.org.br)

5. **Douglas Gollin**  
Chair, SPIA  
Douglas Gollin  
Department of International Development  
Queen Elizabeth House  
3 Mansfield Road  
Oxford OX1 3TB  
United Kingdom  
Tel. +44 (0)1865 281 832  
Email: Douglas.Gollin@williams.edu
6. **Rashid Hassan**  
Director  
Centre for Environmental Economics and Policy in Africa (CEEPA)  
Room 2-6, Agricultural Annex Faculty of Natural and Agricultural  
Sciences University of Pretoria  
Pretoria 0002  
Tel. +27-12-4203317  
Fax: +27-12-4204958  
Email: rashid.hassan@up.ac.za

### **Independent Science and Partnership Council Secretariat (ISPC)**

7. **Peter Richard Gardiner**  
ISPC Executive Director  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla -Room C628  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 52458  
Secretariat Office +39 06 570 52103  
Email: [Peter.Gardiner@fao.org](mailto:Peter.Gardiner@fao.org)  
<http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org>
8. **Sirkka Immonen**  
Senior Agricultural Research Officer  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C634  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 54861  
Email: [Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org](mailto:Sirkka.Immonen@fao.org)
9. **Timothy Kelley**  
Senior Agricultural Research Officer  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C632  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 54210  
Email: [Timothy.Kelly@fao.org](mailto:Timothy.Kelly@fao.org)



- 10. Rachid Serraj**  
ISPC Senior Officer  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C636  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 55659  
Email: [Rachid.Serraj@fao.org](mailto:Rachid.Serraj@fao.org)
- 11. James Stevenson**  
Agricultural Research Officer  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C624  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 52251  
Email: [James.Stevenson@fao.org](mailto:James.Stevenson@fao.org)
- 12. Jenin Assaf**  
ISPC Communication Consultant  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C631  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 53324  
Email: [Jenin.Assaf@fao.org](mailto:Jenin.Assaf@fao.org)
- 13. M<sup>a</sup> Victoria Alemany Martín**  
ISPC Meeting Coordinator  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room C630  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 53645  
Email: [Victoria.Alemany@fao.org](mailto:Victoria.Alemany@fao.org)

### **IEA (Independent Evaluation Arrangement)**

- 14. Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin**  
Head of IEA  
c/o FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room B695  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 53721  
Email: [Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org](mailto:Rachel.Bedouin@fao.org)

### **CGIAR Consortium Office**

- 15. Frank Rijsberman**  
CGIAR Consortium Member  
CGIAR Consortium Office  
c/o Agropolis International  
Avenue Agropolis  
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5

Tel. +33 4 670 47 575  
Email: [f.rijsberman@cgiar.org](mailto:f.rijsberman@cgiar.org)

**16. Jonathan Wadsworth**  
CGIAR Fund  
The World Bank, MSN P6-601  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington, DC 20433 USA  
Tel. +1 202 473 8951  
Email: [j.wadsworth@cgiar.org](mailto:j.wadsworth@cgiar.org)

**17. Luis Anibal Solorzano**  
Director of Staff  
CGIAR Consortium Office  
c/o Agropolis International  
Avenue Agropolis  
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5  
Tel. + 33 4 670 47 575  
Email: [l.solorzano@cgiar.org](mailto:l.solorzano@cgiar.org)

**18. Anne-Marie Izac**  
Chief Science  
CGIAR Consortium Office  
c/o Agropolis International  
Avenue Agropolis  
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5  
Tel. + 33 4 670 47 575  
Email: [A.Izac@cgiar.org](mailto:A.Izac@cgiar.org)

**19. Jacqueline Ashby**  
Gender Senior Advisor  
CGIAR Consortium Office  
c/o Agropolis International  
Avenue Agropolis  
F-34394 Montpellier Cedex 5  
Tel. + 33 4 670 47 575  
Email: [j.ashby@cgiar.org](mailto:j.ashby@cgiar.org)

## **CIAT Board of Trustees and Management Team**

**20. Wanda Collins**  
CIAT Board Chair  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia

Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Direct line Secretariat: + 57 315 254 8671  
Email: c/o [ciat@cgiar.org](mailto:ciat@cgiar.org)

**21. Graham Joscelyne**

Board Audit Committee Chair  
CIAT  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia  
Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Direct line Secretariat: + 57 315 254 8671  
Email: c/o [ciat@cgiar.org](mailto:ciat@cgiar.org)

**22. Deborah Bossio**

CIAT Research Area Director of Soils  
CIAT  
PO Box 863  
Nairobi  
Tel. +254 707 922 977  
Direct line Secretariat (CIAT Colombia): +57 315 254 8671  
Email: [d.bossio@cgiar.org](mailto:d.bossio@cgiar.org)

**23. Juan Lucas Restrepo Ibiza**

Director  
NARI  
Mosquera, Cundinamarca  
Colombia  
Tel. +57 142 273 00  
Email: [jrestrepo@corpoica.org.co](mailto:jrestrepo@corpoica.org.co)

## **CRP Directors & Center Participants**

**24. Bruce Campbell**

(CRP 7)  
CIAT/CCAFS Director (Copenhagen – Denmark)  
Tel. + 45 353 31 040  
Email: [b.campbell@cgiar.org](mailto:b.campbell@cgiar.org)

**25. Karen Brooks**

(CRP 2)  
IFPRI/Policies, Institutions and Markets  
Director  
Address: IFPRI-Washington, DC

2033 K St, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA  
Tel. + +1 202 862 5  
Email: [k.brooks@cgiar.org](mailto:k.brooks@cgiar.org)

**26. John McDermott**

Director  
CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health  
IFPRI-Washington, DC  
2033 K St, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA  
Tel. +1 202 862 5  
Email: [j.mcdermott@cgiar.org](mailto:j.mcdermott@cgiar.org)

**27. Nancy Johnson**

IFPRI  
P.O. Box 30709  
Nairobi 00100, Kenya  
Tel. +254 204 22 3023  
Email: [N.Johnson@cgiar.org](mailto:N.Johnson@cgiar.org)

**28. Thomas Fitz-Randolph**

(CRP 3.7)  
ILRI/Livestock and Fish  
PO Box 30709  
Nairobi 00100  
Tel. + 254 720 826 815  
Email: [t.randolph@cgiar.org](mailto:t.randolph@cgiar.org)

**29. John McIntire**

ILRI/DDG – Integrated Sciences  
ILRI Kenya  
PO Box 30709  
Nairobi 00100  
Tel. + 254 20 422 3000  
Email: [J.McIntire@cgiar.org](mailto:J.McIntire@cgiar.org)

**30. Patrick Dugan**

(CRP 1.3)  
CRP Director Aquatic Ag Systems  
Coordinator IDOs Workshop  
Deputy DG World Fish  
P.O. Box 500, GPO 10670,  
Penang, Malaysia  
Tel. +60-4 626 1606  
Email: [P.Dugan@cgiar.org](mailto:P.Dugan@cgiar.org)

- 31. Suzanne Bertrand**  
ILRI/DDG Research – Biosciences  
c/o ILRI Kenya  
PO Box 30709  
Nairobi 00100  
Tel. +254 726 081 972  
Email: [S.Bertrand@cgiar.org](mailto:S.Bertrand@cgiar.org)
- 32. Graham Thiele**  
(CRP 3.4)  
CIP/RTB Director  
Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina  
Apartado Postal 1558  
Lima, Peru  
Tel. +511 349 6017  
Email: [G.THIELE@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:G.THIELE@CGIAR.ORG)
- 33. Kwesi Atta-Krah**  
IITA/Humid Tropics  
Bioversity Headquarters  
Via dei Tre Denari 472/a  
00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino) Rome  
Italy  
Tel. (39-06) 61181  
Email: [k.atta-krah@cgiar.org](mailto:k.atta-krah@cgiar.org)
- 34. Ylva Hillbur**  
IITA/DDG-R4D  
IITA Nigeria Ibadan  
PMB 5320, Ibadan  
Oyo State – Nigeria  
Tel. +234 2 751 7472  
Email: [y.hillbur@cgiar.org](mailto:y.hillbur@cgiar.org)
- 35. David Hoisintong**  
(CRP 3.5)  
ICRISAT/Grain Legumes  
Dryland Cereals Director  
Patancheru 502324  
Andhra Pradesh  
India  
Tel. +91 403 071 3221  
Email: [d.hoisintong@cgiar.org](mailto:d.hoisintong@cgiar.org)

- 36. Victor Kommerell**  
CIMMYT/Wheat  
Km. 45, Carretera México-Veracruz  
El Batán  
Texcoco de Mora CP 56130  
Edo. De México  
México  
Tel. +52 595 952 1900  
Email: [v.kommerell@cgiar.org](mailto:v.kommerell@cgiar.org)
- 37. David Watson**  
CIMMYT/Maize  
Km. 45, Carretera México-Veracruz  
El Batán  
Texcoco de Mora CP 56130  
Edo. De México  
MÉXICO  
Tel. +52 595 952 1900  
Email: [d.watson@cgiar.org](mailto:d.watson@cgiar.org)
- 38. Robert Nasi**  
(CRP 6)  
CIFOR/Forests Trees Agro-forestry Director  
P.O. Box 0113 BOCBD  
Situ Gede – Bogor 16000  
Indonesia  
Tel. +62 251 862 2622  
Email: [R.NASI@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:R.NASI@CGIAR.ORG)
- 39. Andrew Noble**  
(CRP 5)  
IWMI/Water, Land & Eco Acting Director  
P.O. Box 2075  
Colombo, Sri Lanka  
Tel. +94 11 288 0000  
Email: [A.Noble@cgiar.org](mailto:A.Noble@cgiar.org)
- 40. William Payne**  
(CRP 1)  
Deputy Director General - Research  
ICARDA – Amman Office 2  
Al Rabieh, Mohammed Al Sadeq St.  
Building No. B11, P.O. Box 950764 - Code No. 11195  
Amman – Jordan  
Tel. +962-6-553-1196 (switchboard)  
Email: [w.payne@cgiar.org](mailto:w.payne@cgiar.org)

- 41. Maarten van Ginkel**  
Deputy Director General - Research  
ICARDA – Amman Office 2  
Al Rabieh, Mohammed Al Sadeq St.  
Building No. B11, P.O. Box 950764 - Code No. 11195  
Amman – Jordan  
Tel. +962-6-553-1196 (switchboard)  
Tel. +962(0)779-779-666 (mobile)  
Email: [m.vanginkel@cgiar.org](mailto:m.vanginkel@cgiar.org)
- 42. Bas Bouman**  
(CRP 3.3)  
IRRI/GRI SP Director  
10th Floor Suite 1009, Security Bank Center  
6776 Ayala Avenue Makati  
Metro Manila 1226, Philippines  
Tel. +63 2 856 6133/6129  
Email: [b.bouman@irri.org](mailto:b.bouman@irri.org)
- 43. Brian Belcher**  
CIFOR  
P.O. Box 0113 BOCBD  
Situ Gede – Bogor 16000 Indonesia  
Tel. +62 251 862 2622  
Email: [b.belcher@cgiar.org](mailto:b.belcher@cgiar.org)
- 44. Stephan Weise**  
Bioversity Headquarters  
Via dei Tre Denari 472/a  
00057 Maccarese (Fiumicino) Rome  
Italy  
Tel. (39-06) 61181  
Email: [s.weise@cgiar.org](mailto:s.weise@cgiar.org)
- 45. Stephan Hauser**  
IITA  
PMB 5320, Oyo Road, Ibadan  
Nigeria  
Tel. +234 2 751 7472  
Email: [s.hauser@cgiar.org](mailto:s.hauser@cgiar.org)
- 46. Dagmar Wittine**  
CIP HQ  
Avenida La Molina 1895, La Molina  
Apartado Postal 1558  
Lima, Peru  
Tel. +511 349 6017  
Email: [d.wittine@cgiar.org](mailto:d.wittine@cgiar.org)

- 47. Michael Kidoido**  
ILRI  
P.O. Box 5689  
Addis Ababa  
Ethiopia  
Tel. +251 11 617 2000  
Email: [M.Kidoido@cgiar.org](mailto:M.Kidoido@cgiar.org)
- 48. Marianne Bazinger**  
CIMMYT  
Km. 45, Carretera México-Veracruz  
El Batán  
Texcoco de Mora CP 56130  
Edo. De México  
México  
Tel. +52 595 952 1900  
Email: [m.banziger@cgiar.org](mailto:m.banziger@cgiar.org)
- 49. Boru Douthwaite**  
Principal Scientist  
Worldfish Headquarters  
Policy, Economics & Social Science  
WF-Penang, Malaysia  
P.O. Box 500, GPO 10670  
Tel. +60 46 261 606  
Email: [b.douthwaite@cgiar.org](mailto:b.douthwaite@cgiar.org)
- 50. Stephen Hall**  
WorldFish Director  
Worldfish Headquarters  
Policy, Economics & Social Science  
WF-Penang, Malaysia  
P.O. Box 500, GPO 10670  
Tel. +60 46 261 606  
Email: [s.hall@cgiar.org](mailto:s.hall@cgiar.org)

## **Donors**

- 51. Marlene Diekmann**  
GIZ Germany  
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 40  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Tel. +49 228 44 600  
Email: [marlene.diekmann@giz.de](mailto:marlene.diekmann@giz.de)



- 52. Eric Witte**  
USAID  
Office of Agriculture Research and Transformation  
USAID Bureau for Food Security  
Washington, DC  
USA 20523  
Tel. +1 202 712 1906  
Email: [ewitte@usaid.gov](mailto:ewitte@usaid.gov)
- 53. Shantanu Mathur**  
IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development)  
Technical Adviser, Economic and Financial Analysis  
Technical Advisory Division  
IFAD HQ  
Via Paolo di Dono, 44  
00142 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 5459 2515  
Email: [s.mathur@ifad.org](mailto:s.mathur@ifad.org)
- 54. Juergen Voegele**  
Director of Agriculture and Rural Development  
World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433 USA  
Tel: +1 202 473 1000  
Email: [jvoegele@worldbank.org](mailto:jvoegele@worldbank.org)
- 55. Osamu Koyama**  
Director, Research Strategy Office  
JIRCAS  
1-1 Ohwashi, Tsukuba, 305-8686  
Tokyo, Japan  
Tel. +81 29 838 6706  
Email: [koyama@affrc.go.jp](mailto:koyama@affrc.go.jp)

## **CIAT**

- 56. Rubén Echeverría**  
Director General  
CIAT HQ  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia  
Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Email: [ruben.echeverria@cgiar.org](mailto:ruben.echeverria@cgiar.org)

- 57. Albin Hubscher**  
Deputy Director General – Corporate Services  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [A.Hubscher@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:A.Hubscher@CGIAR.ORG)
- 58. Joe Tohme**  
Agro-biodiversity Research Area Director  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [J.Tohme@cgiar.org](mailto:J.Tohme@cgiar.org)
- 59. Andy Jarvis**  
Director  
Decision and Policy Analysis Research Area  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [A.Jarvis@cgiar.org](mailto:A.Jarvis@cgiar.org)
- 60. Elcio Guimares**  
Director, Latin America and the Caribbean  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email [e.guimaraes@cgiar.org](mailto:e.guimaraes@cgiar.org)  
Tel. Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Email: [e.guimaraes@cgiar.org](mailto:e.guimaraes@cgiar.org)
- 61. Maja Rajasekharan**  
Senior Program Coordinator  
CIAT HQ  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia  
Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Email: [M.Rajasekharan@CGIAR.ORG](mailto:M.Rajasekharan@CGIAR.ORG)
- 62. Andre Zandstra**  
Head of Donor Relations  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [a.zandstra@cgiar.org](mailto:a.zandstra@cgiar.org)
- 63. Daniel Debouck**  
Leader, Genetic Resources Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [d.debouck@cgiar.org](mailto:d.debouck@cgiar.org)
- 64. Michael Peters**  
Leader, Tropical Forages Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [m.peters@cgiar.org](mailto:m.peters@cgiar.org)

- 65. Steve Beebe**  
Leader, Beans Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [s.beebe@cgiar.org](mailto:s.beebe@cgiar.org)
- 66. Edgard Torres**  
Leader, Rice Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [e.a.torres@cgiar.org](mailto:e.a.torres@cgiar.org)
- 67. Clair Hershey**  
Leader, Cassava Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [c.hershey@cgiar.org](mailto:c.hershey@cgiar.org)
- 68. Araceli Castro**  
Leader, LAC Soils Program  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [a.castro@cgiar.org](mailto:a.castro@cgiar.org)
- 69. Mark Lundy**  
CRP 2 Focal Point  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [M.Lundy@cgiar.org](mailto:M.Lundy@cgiar.org)
- 70. Glenn Hyman**  
CRP 6 Focal Point  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [G.Hyman@cgiar.org](mailto:G.Hyman@cgiar.org)
- 71. Jennifer Twyman**  
Gender Expert  
CIAT-CCAFS  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [J.Twyman@cgiar.org](mailto:J.Twyman@cgiar.org)
- 72. Guy Henry**  
Leader, Impact & Strategies Studies  
(CIAT-CIRAD seconded)  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [G.Henry@cgiar.org](mailto:G.Henry@cgiar.org)
- 73. Nathan Russell**  
Head of Corporate Communications  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Tel. ext. 3015  
Email: [N.Russell@cgiar.org](mailto:N.Russell@cgiar.org)

- 74. María Fernanda Reyes**  
CIAT Board Secretary  
CIAT HQ  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia  
Tel. +57 244 50 076  
Email: [m.f.reyes@cgiar.org](mailto:m.f.reyes@cgiar.org)
- 75. Simone Staiger**  
Leader, Capacity Strengthening Theme  
CIAT HQ  
Km 17, Recta Cali-Palmira  
Apartado Aéreo 6713  
Cali, Colombia  
Tel. +57 244 50 000  
Email: [S.Staiger@cgiar.org](mailto:S.Staiger@cgiar.org)
- 76. Sophie Álvarez**  
Capacity Strengthening  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Email: [S.Alvarez@cgiar.org](mailto:S.Alvarez@cgiar.org)
- 77. Carolina Navarrete Frías**  
Decision and Policy Analysis  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Tel. +57 300 555 3937  
Email: [C.Navarrete@cgiar.org](mailto:C.Navarrete@cgiar.org)
- 78. Bernardo Creamer**  
Decision and Policy Analysis  
CIAT HQ (details as above)  
Tel. 4450000 - ext. 3366  
Email: [B.Creamer@cgiar.org](mailto:B.Creamer@cgiar.org)
- 79. Mark Holderness**  
GFAR (Global Forum on Agricultural Research)  
c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - Room B646  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 55047  
Email: [Mark.Holderness@fao.org](mailto:Mark.Holderness@fao.org)