

CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

SCIENCE COUNCIL WORKPLAN 2010-2011

*October 2009*

*Summary*

It is a time of change in the CGIAR. The Science Council expects to transform into an Independent Science and Partnership Council with modified Terms of Reference, and perhaps structure. Although a confirmatory and slightly expanded set of tasks has been suggested for the future ISPC (Independent Task Group report, July 2009) these still have to be discussed by ExCo/the Fund Council. Even when these are confirmed, the installation of the ISPC and the speed with which it can take up its duties are dependent upon the finalisation of the other elements of the new CGIAR. There is certain to be a transitional period from the SC to an interim ISPC (carrying out a mixture of current responsibilities and new ones) before any agreed agenda for the ISPC can be implemented *in toto*.

It is not possible at this time therefore, to elaborate a definitive workplan and budget for the biennium 2010-2011. On this basis, a tentative workplan for the ISPC is proposed to cover continuing, interim functions (2010) and a nominal budget for 2011 in the expectation that this will be reviewed on the completion of the TORs and agreed functions of the ISPC in the coming months.

The continuation budget for the interim SC/ISPC in 2010 is USD 3.972 million including an enlargement of impact assessment activities.

The nominal budget for the functioning ISPC in 2011 is USD 3,615 million.

## **I. Introduction**

The originally mandated functions of the Science Council (SC) have been: (i) quality control, monitoring the work of the CGIAR Centers and programs and to strengthen and extend their impact; (ii) formulation of CGIAR System priorities and research strategies; and (iii) to help mobilize scientific linkages to extend support to the CGIAR research program and the constituency of the CGIAR.

Accordingly, the Science Council has provided leadership and support to the CGIAR in four broad areas: identifying system research priorities; improving monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (MTPs, EPMRs, CPERs, and the PMS); promoting an impact oriented culture in the CGIAR; and, organising activities related to mobilizing science, e.g., the Science Forum 2009. Additional specific studies have been carried out on the context of CGIAR research, notably, for intellectual property concerns, ethics, biofuels, biosafety, and most recently on social science capacity, which are central to the development of updated policies for the Centers and the CGIAR as a whole.

Working through a Panel arrangement, with regular Meetings and with support of the full time Science Council Secretariat good progress was made in completing the planned 2008-2009 workplan and encompassing additional activities (summarised in Annex I and in tabular format in Annex II).

### **Mode of operation in 2004 - 2009**

The SC consists of a Chair and seven Members (six members and the ex officio Chair of SPIA). The Council has held two meetings annually (generally at CGIAR Centers), making decisions in open sessions. During the first 4 years of operation, SC activities were organized under four Panels (Monitoring & Evaluation, Impact Assessment, Priorities & Strategies and Mobilizing Science). Each panel was formed with two SC members and two panel members. The impact assessment group has one SC Member as an independent Chair, plus two panel members.

The panels for Monitoring & Evaluation and Impact Assessment have continued to function. During the last biennium, Priorities & Strategies and Mobilizing Science became portfolios of the whole Science Council with Council members appointed with particular responsibility for acting as focal points for these portfolios.

The SC Secretariat, based at FAO, has provided effective support to Science Council, implementing its decisions and following up with all related technical activities. Professional Officers of the Secretariat provide technical support to working groups, task forces and panels, and assist in the reviews of Medium Term Plans, External Reviews, information management, meeting preparation and follow up of recommendations, special projects (including desk research and literature surveys, analyses and synthesis) and other Council-wide activities. The planned staffing of the Secretariat (as of 2009) is an Executive Director (D2-level), 6 professionals (4 Seniors and 2 Juniors) and 5 administrative staff. However, with the departure of the Executive Director in March 2009 and a junior officer in January 2009,

and the new (D1) post still under competitive international recruitment, the secretariat has been understaffed for much of the year.

## **II. The envisaged change to the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC)**

The new CGIAR calls for an Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) as a standing body to provide advice and support to the Fund and Funders' Summit and to advise the Consortium Board and the global agricultural scientific community.

The Report on the Establishment of the ISPC by an Independent Task Group (ITG) in July 2009 identified the following required functions:

### **1. Actively contribute in defining strategic directions for the CGIAR System**

- Conduct foresight studies and analyze emerging issues with the objective of quantifying the research challenge and the potential impact in response to opportunities and needs identified by ISPC and other stakeholders;
- Mobilize the science community on high priority issues to contribute to the scientific deliberations of the Consortium and its partners;
- Provide input to the development of the strategic results framework (SRF);

### **2. Promote the quality and relevance of science programs in relation to goals and objectives of the new CGIAR**

- Contribute to the development of *ex-ante* impact assessment methodology;
- Undertake *ex-ante* assessment of mega program proposals;
- Analyse M&E results from specific research programs;
- Commission/Organize independent science reviews of Mega and other System-wide Programs;
- Support innovative operational models for the inclusion of relevant stakeholders in evaluating programmatic and system-level impacts from the perspectives of farmers, private sector, civil society and national governments and developmental agencies.

### **3. Mobilize science and promote effective partnerships**

- Search for new advanced science opportunities, beyond the current scope, to address research problems related to the System objectives;
- Develop strategic thinking on effective partnerships in the R&D continuum to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, and global impact of agricultural science to meet developmental goals;
- Collate, integrate, and share body of evidence on networking and partnership arrangements towards optimization of agricultural research for development;
- Evaluate the added value of current partnership arrangements and incentive modalities with emphasis on improving the utility and impact of research outputs.

#### **4. Ensure accountability on overall System impact**

- Provide evidence on the effectiveness of research investments through *ex-post* impact assessment of system programs;
- Increase the rigor and the reach of impact assessment (IA) studies on program areas and system wide activities;
- Facilitate evaluation activities on crosscutting issues such as partnerships, capacity building, diversity, gender and any other relevant ones that may emerge;
- Improve feedback of IA results towards strategic program directions;
- Enhance the ability and rigor of ex-ante IA towards improved strategic decisions;
- Support, through appropriate collaborative mechanisms, Stakeholder Accountability Fora that will independently evaluate the effectiveness of the CGIAR in meeting developmental objectives.

The ISPC will principally provide support in the form of objective analyses and recommendations to the Fund Council (and Funders' Summit) and provide advice to the Consortium Board.

#### **Future Structure of the ISPC (tentative, based on the ITG Report)**

The ISPC is suggested to be structured as a Council<sup>1</sup> with a Chair, six members and 2 ex officio Chairs (one each for program evaluation and impact assessment). It is anticipated that the Council will work through four standing panels:

- Strategy and trends;
- Effective partnerships;
- Independent program evaluation; and
- Independent impact assessment;

and would be supported by a full-time Secretariat<sup>2</sup> (an Executive Director, 4 senior research officers and 2+ administrative staff).

It is only possible to determine the most effective arrangement when the ISPC term of reference and workplan are confirmed. What follows therefore must be considered and a tentative workplan for the interim SC/ISPC to cover continuing, interim functions (2010) and a nominal budget for 2011 in the expectation that this will be reviewed on the completion of the TORs and agreed functions of the ISPC in the coming months.

---

<sup>1</sup> These are yet to be discussed in relation to the formalization of ISPC functions.

<sup>2</sup> Would need to be considered in relation to ISPC Panel structure and work load. Indicative figures used for illustrative budget purposes only.

### **III. A Workplan for the ISPC 2010-2011**

A proposed workplan for the interim SC/ISPC in 2010-2011 is formulated against the same four headings proposed by the ITG paper, with an increased emphasis on Impact Assessment functions and a reduced set of activities with respect to Monitoring and Evaluation. A summary can be found in Section IV, Table 2.

#### **3.1 Strategy and Trends**

**3.1.1. *Publication of IP Stewardship and Liability study and workshop outcomes.*** Two expert reports on stewardship and liability in relation to third party intellectual property were commissioned by the Science Council and the drafts were the subject of a workshop with the Centers, CAS-IP, the CGIAR Secretariat and the Private Sector Committee in late 2009. The papers and recommendations arising from the Workshop will be published in 2010 to inform the development of IP policy and practice by the Consortium. [Continuing activity, 15,000 for publication and brief]

**3.1.2. *Evaluation of modelling or other processes for the identification of global priorities for natural resource management (NRM) research.*** The team charged with the development of the Strategic Results Framework for the new CGIAR has applied analytical procedures in the formulation of research for development priorities that might be addressed in the new CGIAR portfolio. However, the models used tend to highlight production approaches and be less able to identify priorities for the accompanying NRM research - in part because of scale of impact issues relating to the locus of management and NRM policy. There is also a need to evaluate differences in research requirements between agricultural production and managed natural systems. The suggestion is that consideration of alternative methods or modelling advances in this area may inform the development of balanced approaches in the future evaluation of the SRF. [70,000]

**3.1.3. *Stakeholder consultation on key trend analyses and presentation of ISPC outputs.*** The SC will arrange electronic consultations and a face to face process with key stakeholders as part of its first meeting in 2010 to confirm a high priority short-list of analyses required by the Fund Council and the CGIAR at large and which are within the comparative advantage of the ISPC (*per se* or through the independent commissioning of studies, models etc). [15,000]

**3.1.4. *Prospective study (identified under 3.1.3) for the updating of the next iteration of the SRF.***

The first of the prospective studies identified under activity 3 above will be designed in 2010 and conducted in 2011. Subjects that may be considered could include, for instance, the longer term effects of focussing research on poverty alleviation; defining research in relation to rural-urban linkages; or identifying approaches to minor crops research within a larger portfolio. [100,000]

## **3.2 Mobilising effective partnerships**

**3.2.1. *Report on Science Forum 2009.*** The SC will publish reports and briefs which will present the key messages that emerged from Science Forum 2009. In particular, the SC has negotiated with the American Society of Agronomy to publish a special edition of Crop Science based on the papers presented at Science Forum 2009. The intention is to have this published and available as inputs to the GCARD in March 2010. [Continuing activity,15,000]

**3.2.2. *'Intractable problems' workshops.*** The Plan for Mobilizing Science calls for the SC to help engage the more abundant scientific resources and the more endowed expertise and skills available to ARI institutions of the developed world, to bring to bear on the more intractable problems of developing country agriculture. With a view to addressing this, the SC undertakes to select one or two (budget-permitting) specific technical challenges on which it will host a workshop, partnering with a CGIAR Centre and bringing together experts and key scientists from the CGIAR with ARIs. The number of participants will be limited to 30. The criteria for the selection of the topic will include whether making progress on this specific challenge has the potential for significant spill-over benefits across multiple regions, and whether it has relevance to Megaprogram evolution. [New activity, 100,000]

**3.2.3. *Science-based analysis of partnerships with a view to attaining wider impact of research results and enhancing the institutional framework to better link research, extension and development*** The SC will develop modes by which it may evaluate the added value of current mechanisms for partnership and incentive modalities, with a view to improving the utility and impact of research outputs. [New activity]

**3.2.4. *Framework for a CGIAR Visiting Fellowships Program.*** The first element of the Plan for Mobilizing Science calls for the SC to promote linkages between the CGIAR and ARIs. In an effort to address the shortage of senior and mid-career-level scientists within the CGIAR, the SC undertakes to develop a framework for a visiting fellowship program that would facilitate senior academics and researchers from ARIs to spend up to 3 months at a CGIAR Centre, with a view to developing an ongoing relationship, to encourage mentoring and to enhance the mobility of scientists between the CGIAR and ARIs. The framework will include a plan for financing the program, its rules and a plan for future assessment of the impact of the program. The framework (and consultation process) will commence in early 2010 and (finance-permitting) a pilot program targeting specific research areas, where a skills or senior leadership scarcity exists, will begin in 2011. [New Activity 20,000]

**3.2.5. *Science Forum 2011.*** The SC will begin in mid-2010 work on Science Forum 2011. [150,000] [New activity].

## **3.3 Independent program evaluation**

### **3.3.1. *Commissioning and organising external review of SSA-CP***

The SSA-CP is completing its three-year implementation phase that was scheduled for 2007-2009. Due to some delays the work related to this phase will be completed in 2010. ExCo endorsed the 2006 external review recommendations, one of which was that the SC

commission another review at the end of the implementation phase to assess the results of the SSA-CP in three areas: 1) to provide a proof of concept for the IAR4D approach to research organization in Africa; 2) to develop methods for conducting IAR4D; and 3) to establish innovation platforms and compile lessons from them. The SC proposes to commission and organise on behalf of the CGIAR an independent external review in mid-2010 with the aim at evaluating the SSA-CP for its results on social organization of research and providing the CGIAR advice on the future of the program considering both the results and experiences of the implementation and the changes in the CGIAR; how the progress and results should be utilized by regional organizations and stakeholders and by the CGIAR; and what experiences there are for organising research in the new Mega-programs. [CGIAR planned activity – the review costs would be covered by the CP]

### ***3.3.2. Commissioning and organising external review of CIMMYT (pending CIMMYT decision)***

In 2009 CIMMYT approached the SC proposing that the Council would commission an external evaluation ahead of schedule (2010), however, following a process considerably modified from the standard EPMR process. The SC agreed at its 11<sup>th</sup> meeting to conduct a review and developed a proposal for CIMMYT Board on the objectives and process, largely based on CIMMYT's original ideas. The Center, however, decided to postpone the review. Pending CIMMYT's decision to subject itself to an external review in 2010, the SC will seek agreement with the Center regarding the process and organization and subsequently commission and organise the review. [Transitional activity - the review costs are covered by the Center].

***3.3.3. Analytical paper to contribution to the design of M&E for Mega-programs.*** Drawing from previous experience with CPs and experiences of other organizations, funding bodies (such as BMGF and the EU) and funding mechanisms (performance contracts of comparable kind) the SC will prepare a comprehensive think piece contributing to designing a M&E system for the Mega-programs that both satisfy donor requirements of reporting for accountability and provide incentives for ambitious research planning and high performance. [Transition study relying on internal work and limited consultancy; 15,000]

***3.3.4. Guidance to donors regarding the relevance of Center and CP research in transition from Center programs to Mega-programs.*** Following systematic interaction of Centers, CPs and the SC to improve the quality and clarity of Medium-Term planning and the development of EasyMTP local software application and the central CGMap database, most Centers and CPs are preparing MTPs that show the continuum of research from previous years and clearly explains changes as needed. Thus most Centers/CPs have been accepted in the schedule of periodic review (every three years) of their plans. In the transition from Center-centric research planning and implementation to multi-partner program implementation, the SC could assess some MTPs or components of MTPs where, for example, the activities proposed do not comprise a coherent set of research activities that would merit inclusion in a Mega-program, or, where strategic planning or funding shifts have led to considerable change in the research agenda or parts of it. The SC review of MTPs or components of them would be aimed at (i) facilitating the transfer of relevant research elements into new Mega-programs, (ii) regular monitoring of CPs that will not be

transformed into MPs, or (iii) recommending that activities that are not deemed relevant to the CGIAR's core agenda are concluded. [Extension of previous analysis - no cost]

In the course of this activity, the SC can also give guidance to transforming the technical tools (EasyMTP, CGMap) and the process to serve the new research implementation structure of the CGIAR. [Continuing SC inputs - no cost].

**3.3.5. Design the assessment criteria and process for review of Mega-programs** (in 2010) and conduct first *ex ante* reviews (2010-2011). The timing of this work depends on the schedule of determining the topics for the first set of mega-programs and developing proposals for these programs. [New activity of the ISPC. External consultant costs 2-8,000 per MP or 20-80,000 depending upon number of MPs selected for review]

### **3.4 Independent impact assessment**

**3.4.1. Deepening Impact Assessments of CGIAR research – Measuring Environmental Impacts.** The CGIAR has done relatively little to document environmental impacts resulting from its R&D initiatives that affect the soil, water, wildlife and biodiversity of the local, downstream and global landscapes and environments. Efforts to document these 'externalities' have been impeded by difficulties of attribution of the impacts to research, lack of appropriate indicators for tracking environmental impacts, and valuation issues for costs and benefits not priced in the market. SPIA commissioned and is currently providing external technical guidance and support to six CGIAR-research related environmental IA case studies (CIAT, CIP, ICARDA, ICAR, ICRAF and IWMI). The case studies are expected to be completed in April 2010, and a synthesis and results workshop is planned for mid-2010. This will be followed by a comprehensive review of EIA in agricultural research and the development of a conceptual framework for guiding future EIA work in the CGIAR where environmental impacts are a major focus of the new Strategic Results Framework [Active study, costs for 2010, 125,000]

**3.4.2. Measuring Social Impacts.** To deepen the assessments of impact most closely related to CGIAR goals, three critical elements of 'social impact' will be investigated over the next few years, viz:

- a. *Impact of CGIAR research on poverty reduction*
- b. *Impact of CGIAR research on food security*
- c. *Impact of CGIAR research on women (gender study)*

Scoping studies will be commissioned in 2010 to (i) assess the extent of previous work documenting the cumulative evidence of impact of CGIAR research on poverty, food security, and gender (ii) identify methodological challenges and indicators of relevance; and (iii) consider case studies to develop methods and assemble more evidence of social impacts from CGIAR and NARS research. A phase 2, starting with case studies for documenting impacts on poverty (and thereafter food security and gender) would be undertaken if deemed relevant. This work will also feed into the design of the competitive funding under objective 3 of a study on the impact of genetic resources improvement (see 3.4.4). [Planned study, costs for scoping study + poverty impacts case studies preparation in 2010... 70,000]

**3.4.3. Impact Assessment of CGIAR Research Investments in collection, conservation characterisation and use of germplasm.** There remain serious gaps in assessing impacts of particular, traditional activities within the CGIAR portfolio. One such area is ‘germplasm collection, conservation, characterization and evaluation’ (GCCCE). The aim of this study would be to compile the documentable evidence of the impacts in terms of CGIAR goals from GCCCE related activities. In addition to quantifying in physical terms, the amount of germplasm collected, conserved, characterized and evaluated by CGIAR centres, the study would focus on estimating the value of the stored material using concepts like existence values, inter-generational equity and the like, as well as their contemporary value as sources of genetic material for breeding and biotechnology. [Planned activity – scoping study costs in 2010... \$22,000]

**3.4.4. Crop germplasm improvement: updating databases and analyses of varietal adoption and assessment of economic, social and environmental impacts.** There is a need to update the previous impact assessment of crop germplasm improvement, which used data from the 90s, and expand the evaluation to cover Africa. A 3-year \$2.8 million grant proposal on “Tracking Varietal Change and Assessing the Impact of Crop Genetic Improvement Research in Sub-Saharan Africa” has been developed finalized with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Bioversity International (on behalf of SPIA/SC)<sup>3</sup>. A separate component may soon be added to cover crop improvement in Asia/SE Asia using funding from the Gates Foundation and ACIAR. [Planned study, costs for 2010 \$35,000]

**3.4.5. Examining the potential of using randomized control trials for enhancing rigour and credibility in conducting large-scale ex-post impact assessment**

Phase 1 of this study – a literature review and conceptual analysis of the potential of using RCTs in epIAs – makes an explicit differentiation between the practice of ‘impact evaluation’ and ‘ex post impact assessment’ based on timing and motivations, and draws comparisons and implications for the scope and feasibility of using experimental designs along the results chain of R4D activities. The next phase will seek to compare in the field the potential value in using RCTs to estimate more credibly a key parameter in epIAs, the treatment effect, or ‘k’ factor. For two or three just released (and promising) CG-derived improved crop varieties, the effectiveness and efficiency of using (i) experimental, (ii) quasi-experimental and (iii) standard approaches for establishing the treatment effect (Es) in large scale epIAs will be evaluated, e.g., for a maize improved variety, a sorghum improved variety, and a pigeonpea improved variety. The objective is to determine the cost effectiveness of using RCTs for assessing the value of some common CGIAR outputs [Planned study, costs for 2010 \$ 195,000]

**3.4.6. Impact Assessment: Communication/Outreach**

Two elements of communication of results of the impact assessment activities will be considered during the biennium: a). SPIA - Center Impact Assessment Focal Point (IAFP) meeting: biennial meetings with general (sharing of information) and specific agendas related to impact assessment practices in the CGIAR [continuing series –\$40,000 (2011 only)].

---

<sup>3</sup> The SC will lead the steering committee for this project and will organize the independent analysis and synthesis of findings. The SC costs in this budget cover steering committee and related costs only. The grant purse is administered by Bioversity International on behalf of the CGIAR.

b. Updates and a re-design of the CGIAR Impact webpage will need attention during 2010. This will be based on a systematic and comprehensive assessment of clients (donors) and their IA related needs [25,000].

#### IV. Budget

**Table 1: CGIAR Science Council/interim ISPC proposed budget for 2010 only**

<b>CGIAR SCIENCE COUNCIL 2010-2011 PROPOSED BUDGET (US\$000)</b>				
<b>Contributions</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
FAO	786	1,286	1,286	
WORLD BANK	786	786	786	
DONORS' FUNDING POOL	2,000	1,500	1,900	
<i>Total</i>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>3,972</b>	<b>3,615</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
<b>COUNCIL</b>				
Honoraria Chair and Office	311	317	317	317
Honoraria (Council & Panel Members)	250	250	270	290
Travel & Per Diem (Chair, Council & Panel Members)	225	225	225	243
<i>Sub-Total SC Honoraria, Travel and Per Diem</i>	<b>786</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>850</b>
SPME – Standing Panel on Program Evaluation	115	100	70	tbd
Standing Panel Impact Assessment (SPIA)	143	143	480	240
P& S Portfolio – Standing Panel on Strategy and Trends	225	100	200	100
MS Portfolio - Standing Panel on Mobilising Effective Partnerships	70	200	170	180
<i>Sub-Total SC Technical Activities</i>	<b>553</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>520</b>
<i>Sub-Total Council</i>	<b>1,339</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>1,732</b>	<b>1,370</b>
<b>SECRETARIAT</b>				
Professional and Administrative Staff salaries	1,887	1,887	1,945	1,945
Travel & Per Diem	121	120	110	100
Consultants & Research Assistants	115	115	85	100
Misc. Operating Expenses	110	115	100	100
<i>Sub-Total Secretariat</i>	<b>2,233</b>	<b>2,237</b>	<b>2,240</b>	<b>2,245</b>
<b>TOTAL COUNCIL &amp; SECRETARIAT</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>3,972</b>	<b>3,615</b>
<b>DIFFERENCE (CONTRIBUTIONS - EXPENDITURES)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Notes:**

- This table does not include external funds (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation).
- 2008 figures reported as per previous Workplan & budget.
- 2009 figures include actual receipts and projected annual costs.
- The form of funding support to the ISPC in 2011 requires discussion between the co-sponsors and the Fund Council, once formed.

**Table 2: Breakdown of Proposed Interim SC Technical Activities in 2010-2011**

Areas of responsibility	Function/activity	Title	\$'000 2010	\$'000 2011 <sup>4</sup>
<b>Foresight and strategy</b>	study	3.1.1 <i>Publication of IP Stewardship &amp; Liability</i>	15	
	core function	3.1.2 <i>Identification of modelling/method inputs to refine priorities for NRM research</i>	70	
	meeting	3.1.3 <i>Key trend analyses and presentation of ISPC outputs</i>	15	
	study	3.1.4 <i>Prospective study contributing to SRF updating</i>	100	
		<b>Foresight and strategy Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Mobilizing Effective partnerships</b>	meeting	3.2.1 <i>Report on Science Forum 2009</i>	15	
	meeting	3.2.2 <i>'Intractable problems' workshops</i>	100	
	study	3.2.3 <i>Science-based analysis of partnerships</i>		
	core function	3.2.4 <i>Framework for a CGIAR Visiting Fellowships Program</i>	20	
	meeting	3.2.5 <i>Science Forum 2011</i>	150	
		<b>Mobilizing Effective partnerships Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>Transition M&amp;E and cx ante evaluation</b>	core function	3.3.1 <i>External review of SSA-CP</i>	0	
	core function	3.3.2 <i>External review of CIMMYT (pending CIMMYT decision)</i>	0	
	study	3.3.3 <i>Contribution to the design of M&amp;E for Mega-programs</i>	15	
	core function	3.3.4 <i>Relevance of Center &amp; CP research in transition from Center programs to Mega-programs</i>	0	
	core function	3.3.5 <i>Design assessment criteria &amp; process for review of Mega-programs</i>	55	
	core function	<i>Performance Measurement System</i>	0	
		<b>Transition M&amp;E / cx ante evaluation Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>tbd</b>
<b>Impact assessment</b>	study	3.4.1 <i>Environmental Impact Assessment case studies – finalization, workshop and reports</i>	125	
	study	3.4.2 <i>Social impact assessment – background studies</i>	70	
	study	3.4.3 <i>Genetic resources and biodiversity IA study</i>	22	
	study	3.4.4 <i>CGI impact update study – steering cmt meeting (once per year) &amp; related tasks</i>	35	
	study	3.4.5 <i>Field testing RCT approaches</i>	195	
	core function	3.4.6 <i>Communication of IA results analysis</i>	25	
	core function	<i>Performance Measurement System – Impact Indicator, external peer reviews</i>	8	
	meeting	<i>IAFP-SPIA biennial meeting</i>	0	
		<b>Impact Assessment Total</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>240</b>
		<b>Sub-Total SC Technical activities</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>520</b>

<sup>4</sup> Estimates based on projected activities (e.g., USD150,000 towards Science Forum 2011, continuation of SPIA studies started in 2010). Subject to changes upon finalization of ISPC TOR.

## Annex I

### A summary of progress made during 2008-2009 by the science council

#### **1. Refining the Science Council's M&E Strategy**

In the light of the CGIAR Change Process that began at the end of 2007, where it was foreseen that there would be changes to how research would be implemented in the CGIAR, the SC deferred from a major revision of the written strategy for M&E in the CGIAR. There were minor changes to the EPMR process (including better harmonization of data collection across reviews and more explicit guidance for EPMR teams to build on other M&E information). The SC also emphasised in the SPME meeting minutes and Council reports, for example, a) the importance for donors to receive and use the System's M&E information, rather than require their own parallel reporting and conduct parallel reviews; and b) to use various sources of M&E information (EPMRs, impact assessment and Performance Measurement information) to guide their funding decisions rather than base such decisions mechanistically on annual PM results only. In 2009 the SC synthesized its experiences in a document *Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and experiences*; and drawing from its experiences and perspectives a think piece for the benefit of M&E planning in the future: *Monitoring and Evaluation in the new CGIAR*.

#### **2. The external reviews of the Generation CP, Bioversity International, ICRISAT and IRRI will be conducted during 2008-2009**

The first external review of the Generation CP was completed in 2008, and the EPMRs of ICRISAT and IRRI in 2009. The EPMR Report of Bioversity International will be considered at SC12, in September 2009.

#### **3. Assessment of Medium-Term Plans**

The SC prepared guidelines and carried out an assessment of Center and CP Medium-Term Plans in 2008 and 2009. In 2008 it initiated a process in which MTPs of sufficient clarity and quality were graduated to a schedule of periodic in-depth review (once in three-years) by the SC. Thus, in 2008, seven Centers' MTPs were endorsed without an in-depth review on the basis of the good quality MTP submitted the previous year. In 2009, an additional five MTP were included in this category.

This staggering of MTP reviews by the SC coincided with the development of a local application software for submitting MTPs (EasyMTP) and a Central database (CGMap) for storing the MTP data, both of which were operational for the first time in 2008. This has transformed the MTP into a set of data items stored in a searchable and analysable database from which also a single document can be downloaded for review or information purposes. The SC was closely involved with the Centers and the ICT-KM in the design and development of the key characteristics of these new tools. The CGMap allows analysis of different aspects of the MTPs at a system level as it is likely to facilitate the transition from Center programs to mega-programs.

#### **4. Review of CGIAR Social Science research**

The first phase of the Social Science Stripe Review, which was a descriptive phase conducted as a desk study, was completed in 2008. The first phase yielded three products: 1. A

background data report; 2. A normative framework for conducting social science research in the CGIAR; and 3. the terms of reference for the main phase of the review. The main phase was conducted by the panel Chair, Chris Barrett, who also oversaw the 1<sup>st</sup> phase, and three other members representing diverse disciplinary backgrounds. The panel's report was completed in August 2009 and will be considered at SC 12. in September.

#### ***5. Performance Monitoring of CGIAR impact indicator***

SPME coordinated the SC's contribution to the PMS. This included preparation of the PMS instructions for both 2008 and 2009. The instructions and assessment criteria were revised particularly for the outcome indicator; a revised single indicator for publications was designed and discussion and development of a capacity building indicator was initiated. The SC's assessed the outcome indicator in 2008 and 2009. All the results on research-related indicators, and conclusions and analysis of them were communicated to the Centers in a feed-back document and individually in more detail. In 2008, SPME prepared an analytical paper suggesting revisions to the PMS, particularly regarding the results-based indicators, and it participated in organising a joint workshop in Washington where SPME, SPIA and the SC Secretariat were represented. In 2009 the SC prepared a paper on experiences from five years of the PMS as one section of a joint document from the SC and the CGIAR Secretariat.

SPIA has worked closely with the Center Impact Assessment Focal Points (IAFPs) in joint meetings and kept the ADE group advised as various changes to the impact indicator, guided by principles of transparency and comprehensiveness, have been proposed and implemented. SPIA uses a combination of Center self-assessment, external peer review and its own judgement to evaluate Center submissions each year. It reports back collectively and individually each year to Centers to help improve performance.

#### ***6. Impact Assessment Focal Point (IAFP) Meeting***

IAFPs from 13 Centers, two CPs and two SWEPS, two donor agencies, several IA/evaluation experts, SPIA and SC Secretariat staff and EMBRAPA scientists attended the biennial IAFP-SPIA meeting at EMBRAPA HQ 10-11 November 2008. As with previous SPIA-IAFP meetings, a significant amount of time was spent hearing from the Centers about their current IA related work and identifying challenges in IA. This was followed by sessions on donor expectations about IAs, proposed modifications for Impact Indicators in the PMS, clarifying purposes and exploring new approaches in epIA, discussing strategic issues in IA for the CGIAR, and presentations on: the use of randomized control trials for epIA, inter-center collaboration and unexplored IA areas. Key outcomes are described in "Defining and Refining Good Practice in epIA: A Synthesis Report", March 2009.

#### ***7. Publication of forthcoming SPIA documents in the first trimester of 2008***

Several publications—final reports of SPIA-commissioned studies—were completed, printed and distributed in 2008, including:

- Strategic Guidance for Conducting Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research
- Impact Assessment of Policy-oriented Research in the CGIAR: Evidence and Insights from Case Studies
- An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution
- Short 4-6 page 'impact briefs' were published for each of the above full length reports

### **8. Environmental and social impacts of CGIAR Research**

Phase one of this study was recently completed with the finalization of two consultancy reports after external peer review. One was a scoping study reviewing the state of arts in environmental and social impact (ESI) assessment and proposing an approach to quantifying environmental impacts through extended cost-benefit analysis (Bennett, 2009). The other focused on indicators and other measures of ESI that are considered separately with market costs and benefits using weighted indices and cost effectiveness (Djurfeldt, Fagerström and Fredholm, 2009). With novel approaches in hand, SPIA developed a proposal for moving forward with phase two – six Center case studies (IWMI, ICRAF, CIAT, CIP, ICARDA, ICAR) have been selected after external peer review. In June 2009, a planning and methodology workshop was held to finalise the workplans. The case studies are currently being implemented and a results workshop is planned in early/mid 2010.

### **9. Internal CGIAR demands for and uses of Impact Related Information**

A 'synthesis' of the earlier desk study was prepared which summarized the findings of the exploratory study and attempted to respond to many of the major comments from the three external reviewers and SPIA members on the initial draft report. The demand for this study derives from an increasing emphasis given to learning for decision making and priority setting from all forms of evaluation, of which epIA is one. SPIA maintains that learning should not come at the expense of de-emphasizing accountability. SPIA members agreed that given the lack of interest amongst center management for another set of interviews and questionnaires, it was best to defer initiation of the next phase of this study. Also, more clarity with respect to null hypotheses and appropriate method and means to test these is required before launching phase two.

### **10. Implementation of CGIAR System Priorities via Framework Plans**

A green cover report "*System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015*", re-published in 2007, was the product of a three year Delphi-type process identifying science areas of relevance to the CGIAR and to the MDGs. One framework plan showing how an area could be implemented was developed and several others at a lesser level of detail. The approach was eventually taken over by research structured under "development challenges".

Although the strategy and results framework for the new CGIAR will replace the system priorities in due course, much of the definition of scope of activities and their descriptions, including the integration of priority areas for research, remain relevant for discussions of Mega-program development. The SC provided input into Working Group 1 of the Change process in identifying Key Research Opportunities for the CGIAR in 2008.

### **11. Ethics and the Mission of the CGIAR**

The study was undertaken in response to a SC-commissioned review paper by Peter Sandoe, assisted by Karsten Klint Jensen, entitled "*How Should the CGIAR Handle Ethical Challenges?*" on the possible ethical issues affecting the CGIAR. The report identified four major areas of ethical concern to the CGIAR: research ethics, equity, protecting nature and respect for donors and partners. The study was completed in 2008 and compiled with two previous ethics studies (ethical challenges, ethics & CGIAR research) into a single report (Green cover). The Change Management Working Group 1 drew on some elements of the report.

#### **12. *IP Stewardship and Liability***

The study is a follow-up to an earlier SC-GRPC work “CGIAR Research Strategies for IPG in a Context of IPR: Report and Recommendations Based on Three Studies” (White cover, October 2006) and is addressing two main areas of consideration that GRPC saw as a prerequisite for the discussion on a possible new IP guidelines in the CGIAR. In close collaboration with CAS-IP, three consultants were hired to prepare the study, and the discussion draft was submitted to GRPC25 & SC11 in April 2009. A consultation with SC, CAS-IP, ADE, PSC, and CG Sec has been scheduled on 14 November 2009 (preceded by a ADE-PSC workshop on research management) to seek inputs for the further revision of the report in order to improve its practical utility, and to encourage a comprehensive approach to IP issues in general throughout the System.

#### **13. *Biosafety Workshop***

A workshop *Biotechnology, Biosafety and the CGIAR* was convened in order to implement the final recommendation in the 2004 “Report of the Biosafety Panel to the CGIAR Science Council on Biosafety Policy Practices of the CGIAR Centers” (published May 2007). The workshop report was published in February 2009 (White cover), where the participants recommended an establishment of a Biosafety Research Support Network. Follow-up work is required to consider how such a Network can be established and maintained.

#### **14. *Planning and Mobilizing Global Agricultural Science***

The SC continued to consult with stakeholders in considering means by which science can be better mobilized to address the goals of the CGIAR. In light of consultations, the SC has further refined its draft Plan for Mobilizing Science, drafted at the request of ExCo-14 and endorsed by ExCo-15. The Science Council’s role is that of a catalyst, facilitating linkages between the CGIAR and current and emerging stakeholders. With this plan, the Council is addressing the challenge of mobilizing science on three major fronts: (i) promoting linkages between the CGIAR and ARIs; (ii) promoting linkages between the CGIAR and institutions involved in product development and deployment; and (iii) increasing the visibility of the ‘science for development’ concept by organising a biennial Science Forum. The draft plan will be further refined in line with the mandate of the new ISPC.

#### **15. *Joint CGIAR – Scientific Communities Meeting on Science for Development.***

Science Forum 2009 was held on 16-17 June, in Wageningen, the Netherlands. It brought together more than 300 scientists from 55 countries, from advanced research centres, NARS, NGOs and from every CGIAR Centre to explore recent scientific advances in six domains and to identify areas where there is untapped potential to deliver an impact on development goals. The Forum also explored new modalities for research collaboration between the CGIAR and partners. The Science Forum was organised by the CGIAR Science Council in partnership with the CGIAR Secretariat, the Alliance of the CGIAR Centres, the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) and Wageningen University and Research Centre.

#### **16. *Final publication of the CGIAR Center-CSO Partnerships study.***

A study of CGIAR-CSO partnerships: the study had been finalized with a summary published as Science Council Brief (Number 20, December 2007).

### ***17. Biofuels Policy Statement***

A SC position paper on biofuels was published that draws attention to critical issues surrounding biofuels, food security and the environment, highlighting the positive and negative consequences likely to emerge from different biofuels policies. A biofuels policy statement was proposed. The expansion of biofuels production worldwide has clear implications for CGIAR research, in particular for: (i) policy-related research—especially developing analytical frameworks and tools to assess the potential impacts of biofuels production on food security and environmental sustainability; and, (ii) sustainable intensification of traditional and new food crop and livestock systems; maintaining a tight focus on food security and environmental health goals consistent with the CGIAR mandate.

### ***18. Systemwide initiatives***

As follow-up to a meta-review of the Systemwide programs completed in 2007, the SC prepared an analysis with recommendations for defining an optimal role for systemwide initiatives in an evolving CGIAR: *The Role of Systemwide Initiatives in Implementing the CGIAR's Research Agenda; An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (2008)*.

### ***19. Contributions to the CGIAR Change Process***

Although not part of the original SC WorkPlan the SC has contributed to four documents (3 published and one in progress) providing perspectives on the change, including Lessons Learned from M&E; Requirements for M&E in the new CGIAR; and Defining the role of a new ISPC. The SC is currently contributing with the CGIAR secretariat to a joint Lessons Learned document on the CGIAR's Performance Management System (PMS).

## ANNEX II

### UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SCIENCE COUNCIL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE 2008-2009 WORKPLAN

ACTIVITY	STATUS
1. Refining the Science Council's M&E Strategy	M&E related documents completed in 2009. Resulted in new guidelines and two papers on SC's experience with M&E (and draft on experiences with PMS) and a paper of needs for the new CGIAR
2. The external reviews of the Generation CP, Bioversity International, ICRISAT and IRRI	GCP review completed 2008; EPMRs of ICRISAT, IRRI and Bioversity completed in 2009. (Report on Bioversity MTP Report to be considered at SC12)
3. Assessment of Medium-Term Plans	Assessment completed and SC MTP commentary submitted to ExCo in autumn 2008 and autumn 2009 (following SC review and finalisation of Commentary at SC12)
4. Review of CGIAR Social Science research	1 <sup>st</sup> phase completed by September 2008 and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Phase completed by September 2009 Final Study Report to be considered at SC12
5. Performance Monitoring of CGIAR impact indicator	Indicator assessments completed by May in 2008 and in 2009, results shared with Centers and reported to ExCo. Experiences from five years of PMS written up in 2009
6. Impact Assessment Focal Point Meeting	Completed; key outcomes and major discussion points summarized in "Defining and Refining Good Practice in Ex-Post Impact Assessment: A Synthesis Report", March 2009
7. Publication of forthcoming SPIA documents in the first trimester of 2008	Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Guidance for Conducting Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research (final report)</li> <li>• Impact Assessment of Policy-oriented Research in the CGIAR: Evidence and Insights from Case Studies (final report)</li> <li>• An Assessment of the Impact of Agricultural Research in South Asia since the Green Revolution (final report)</li> <li>• Short 4-6 page 'impact briefs' were published for each of the above full length reports</li> </ul>
8. Environmental and Social Impacts of CGIAR Research	Completed Phase I (two peer reviewed consultancy reports on environmental and social impact indicators); Phase II in progress with six Center case studies to document environmental impacts of CGIAR research.
9. Internal CGIAR demands for and uses of Impact Related Information	Completed. Phase I exploratory study (desk study report and final synthesis); Decision taken to defer implementation of Phase 2 until after CGIAR reform process / transition completed.

10. Implementation of CGIAR System Priorities via Framework Plans	Completed. <i>System Priorities for CGIAR Research 2005-2015</i> (green cover, republished in 2007). A summary on the process and concept behind the priority-setting exercise was submitted to the SRF group in 2009.
11. Ethics and the Mission of the CGIAR	Completed. <i>Ethical challenges for the CGIAR: Report of three Studies</i> (2008, green cover)
12. IP Stewardship and Liability	Ongoing. Discussion draft submitted to GRPC25 & SC11 (April 2009). Consultative meeting will be held with SC, CAS-IP, ADE, PSC, and CG Sec on 14 November 2009 to seek inputs for revision, discuss IP issues in general, and to encourage a comprehensive approach to new IP guidelines in the CGIAR.
13. Biosafety Workshop	Completed (with possible follow-up). Workshop report <i>Biotechnology, Biosafety and the CGIAR</i> published in February 2009 (White cover). Requires possible follow-up action in order to consider how a Biosafety Research Support Network can be established and maintained.
14. Planning and Mobilizing Global Agricultural Science	Consulted with stakeholders and refined the Draft Plan for Mobilizing Science
15. Joint CGIAR – Scientific Communities Meeting on Science for Development	Science Forum 2009, was held on 16-17 June, in Wageningen, the Netherlands. Immediate outcomes provided to the SRF team. Full Report by March 2010
16. Final publication of the CGIAR Center-CSO Partnerships study	Completed. Summary publication (Science Council Brief Number 20, December 2007).
17. SC policy statement on Biofuels	Completed. "Biofuels Research in the CGIAR: A Perspective from the Science Council" (May, 2008).
18. Systemwide initiatives	Published : <i>The Role of Systemwide Initiatives in Implementing the CGIAR's Research Agenda; An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs</i> (2008).
19. Contributions to the CGIAR Change Process	Contributed: <i>Key research opportunities for the CGIAR</i> (SC, June 2008) - Science Council's contribution to the paper of WG 1 <i>Defining the role of an Independent Science and Partnership Council</i> (SC, April 2009). <i>Monitoring and Evaluation: Processes and Experiences</i> (SC, April 2009) <i>Monitoring and Evaluation in the new CGIAR</i> (SC, May 2009) - A discussion document that looks at the likely needs for monitoring and evaluation processes in the new CGIAR <i>Lessons learned from 5 years of the PMS: Research Performance Indicators</i> (draft)