

CCAFS

9th INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING

Minutes

#1 email consultation

1) Agenda, minutes, matters arising and *ex officio* update

1.1 Adoption of agenda

1.2 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

Minutes

The minutes were approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 8th ISP meeting. The approved minutes without confidential elements have been placed on the CCAFS website.

Follow-up actions from previous meetings

Key actions and follow-ups on decisions from previous meetings are outlined in background paper (CCAFS ISP9/1.2.2).

Matters arising

3) Update on CCAFS: history and future steps. The ISP discussed the proposals from other parts of the CGIAR to split CCAFS into an adaptation and mitigation. This proposal seems to have been rejected and adaptation-mitigation are included in the current Phase II pre-proposal.

4.1) Private Sector Engagement: Update. The ISP endorsed the collaboration with World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD) to develop a science-based roadmap for ambitious implementation of CSA to 2030. This activity goes well with an announcement from WBCSD scheduled for the Paris COP. The ISP also asked the PMC to formulate a set of strategic research questions to guide private sector research. In each of the Flagships in the pre-proposal there are research questions that include a private sector component. Examples include:

- What motivates the private sector to take up and promote CSA?
- What is the potential of impact investment to incentivize equitable adoption of CSA practices and portfolios at local levels through a value chain approach?
- Is certification of climate-smartness a viable and marketable business model that delivers equitable benefits to farmers, and in so doing, promote adoption of CSA practices and portfolios?
- How can insurance be best designed, bundled with other synergistic risk management options, and targeted to address particular climate-related agricultural risks?

- What public-private partnership arrangements and business models best enable insurance for smallholder farmers in a given context, in a manner that is scalable and sustainable?
- What are the impacts of public and private regulations, and hybrid governance arrangements on avoided deforestation, reduced emissions, and local livelihoods?
- What are the roles of civil society, private sector, and non-traditional actors in shaping discourse and how can they assist in strengthening governance arrangements in the face of climate change

4.3) Global Alliance on Climate-Smart Agriculture (GACSA). The ISP requested CCAFS management to review CCAFS' role in GACSA at the end of the Inception Year. CCAFS has undertaken a systematic review of the criticism of CSA and has examined the validity of the various points. Few criticisms are strongly grounded in fact. This will be published as a peer-reviewed paper. Because of the budget cuts CCAFS will step back from its co-facilitator of GACSA knowledge action group, but will continue to participate actively in all three groups.

4.4) Climate Information Services: downscaling, reaching users, integrating with other agricultural advisories. The ISP asked CCAFS management to strengthen evidence of the value of climate services for agriculture and food security including formal scientific analysis and stakeholder farmer feedback/views. To this end a position will be filled by 2016 to be based in ILRI Ethiopia and working closely with African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC).

12.2) 2015 budget and financial update. The ISP requested PMC to follow up on the various issues noted in the presentation. With the resignation of the CCAFS Manager for Finance, Contracts & Liaison these follow ups have still to be done. They will be tackled as soon as a new person is in place.

1.3 Updates from ex officio members

Program Director

Since the last meeting of the ISP, one of the main activities of the CCAFS core team was the preparation of the pre-proposal for Phase II (Phase II is dealt with under other agenda items). Another major task was hosting the External Evaluators in all the CCAFS regions, participating in their workshop and responding to their initial recommendations. The CGIAR has been hit by budget cuts and this has consumed a lot of time – this will be part of the discussion at the virtual meeting. CCAFS participated actively in various meetings at SBSTA in Bonn in June. These Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advise (SBSTA) to the UNFCCC meetings were significant given the first two (of four) agriculture workshops were part of the official agenda. CCAFS had prepared a number of background papers for these and had them discussed in a pre-SBSTA workshop with African negotiators. We have evidence that CCAFS science helped inform several country positions at SBSTA and some policy discussions which ensued (e.g. In Kenya). CCAFS was also active in the “Our Common Future under Climate

Change science conference” held in July in Paris. Preparations are now well in hand for the UNFCCC COP21 in Paris (30 November-11 December). In August we submitted a report to DFID showing good progress on scaling up climate-smart outcomes. CCAFS is about to lose its East African Regional Program Leader, Dr James Kinyangi, who will take up a position at the Africa Development Bank. He will be much missed, as his work on Climate-Smart Villages and work with the African Group of Negotiators was exemplary. This is our first loss of staff from one of the Regions or Themes since we started in 2010. In the last six months we have also been operating with an Acting Manager for Finance, Contracts & Liaison, while we recruit a replacement for Angela Samundengo who left us in June 2015.

Future Earth

Future Earth Science Committee met in mid-2015 – a key decision was around the development of Knowledge Action Networks (KANs), with one of those to be focussed on the Food-Energy-Water nexus. CCAFS has commented on the initial proposals for this KAN and is likely to play a substantial role in helping shape that KAN and contributing to its implementation. Future Earth continues to have regular project webinars, and CCAFS has participated in most of them. There have been a number of meetings in different countries where Future Earth has been showcased as a new global initiative. These meetings are designed to stimulate national scientists to link to the emerging agenda of Future Earth. For example, there was a Future Earth session in the 26th IUGG General Assembly (Prague, June) at which CCAFS presented. Forthcoming meetings of the Global Environment Research Committee of the Royal Society (GERC) and the Swedish Secretariat for the Environmental Earth System Sciences will also include CCAFS presentations. Future Earth is involved in various outreach activities, including around the Sustainable Development Goals. One of those involved a series of blogs for The World Economic Forum. CCAFS contributed a blog on Goal 2 (End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote).

CIAT Board of Trustees (BoT)

Bruce Campbell presented a program update at the last CIAT BoT meeting, participating via a video link. This focused on the 2014 Annual report, risk management and Phase 2 preparations. Chuck Rice gave a presentation covering (a) overview of evaluations, reviews and impact studies, (b) the results of the Theme 3 CCER and the management response; (c) the response to the Internal Auditors report; (d) External Evaluation process; (e) 2014 year-end financial report; and (f) the 2015 budget. The Board approved the responses to the Theme 3 evaluation and to the internal audit, and approved the 2015 budget. Bruce Campbell also participated in various committee meetings, for example the one on risk management, where the CCAFS approach to risk management was included. CCAFS will update its risk catalogue to reflect the new format adopted by CIAT. He also participated in a session on internal audits where the results of the internal audit of CCAFS were discussed with the internal auditors. No CCAFS-specific decisions were taken.

The next BoT meeting will be in Cali on 9-11th November. Bruce will participate in person, while Brian Keating will participate through video.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.1 Minutes from the 8th CCAFS ISP meeting (confidential)

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous Meeting

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.3 List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Decisions:

To note that the minutes from the 8th meeting have been approved by the ISP via email consultation

To note the progress on matters arising from the previous minutes

To note the updates from ex officio members

2) Update on Phase 2 proposal and process

CCAFS submitted the phase 2 pre-proposal on 15th August. As part of the pre-proposal development process a series of inputs were sought from Centers and partners. This included identifying 19 Strategic Partners with whom discussions were held as to the nature of the future collaboration. The pre-proposal was shared with all other CRPs for their input and we gave input to other CRPs. The pre-proposal was shared with the ISP. The process going forward is as follows:

- a) Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) is reviewing the portfolio and doing prioritisation analyses of the System Level Outcomes (SLOs), Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) and sub-IDOs
- b) 29th September: ISPC presents an analysis of the gaps in the portfolio
- c) Consortium Office undertakes a value for money exercise, examining CRP budgets in relation to proposed outcomes
- d) Early November: Fund Council meets to discuss the pre-proposals and the input they receive from the ISPC and Fund Council; they announce the results as to which CRPs and Flagships inside CRPs will be funded and a budget envelope for each CRP.
- e) Mid-November: One-on-one discussions between CRP Leader and ISPC and Consortium Office
- f) 16 November – Call for full proposals is made
- g) 31 March – Full proposal deadline

Decisions:

- To note the process going forward for the full proposal
- To request that the full proposal be circulated in late January for input by the ISP

3) Internal Performance Management Indicators

The CCAFS Internal Performance Management Indicators are generally showing good results for CCAFS. We have a few categories where performance could be better, and two categories with poor performance. One poor category relates to gender where the PMC regards the numbers of journal articles with a gender dimension as being unacceptable. We have put in place measures to rectify this, notably the employment of a Gender and Social Inclusion Research Leader. The other poor category relates to Program Participant Agreement (PPA) implementation, where 3 Centres failed to submit their technical reports on time.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP9/3.1 CCAFS Internal Performance Management Indicators

Decisions:

- To take note of the results of the Performance Management Indicators
- To agree on the targets for 2015

15 October
Virtual meeting
Minutes

Participants: Brian Keating (Chair) (Ithaca, NY)
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*) (Ithaca, NY)
Arona Diedhiou (virtual)
Fatima Denton (virtual)
Ruvimbo Mabeza-Chimedza (virtual)
Charles Rice (*ex officio*, CIAT BoT) (virtual)
Carolina Vera (*ex officio*, Future Earth) (virtual)
Christof Walter
Ram Badan Singh (virtual)

Regrets: Mercedes Bustamente

Invited participants: *Program Management Committee*
Andy Jarvis (participating virtually from Cali)
Pramod Aggarwal (participating virtually from New Delhi)
Lini Wollenberg (participating virtually from Vermont)
Sonja Vermeulen (participating virtually from UK)
Robert Zougmore (participating virtually from Mali)
Sophia Huyer (Ithaca, NY)

Others

Ana Maria Loboguerrero (participating virtually from Cali)
James Kinyangi (participating virtually from Nairobi)
Leocadio Sebastien (participating virtually from Hanoi)
Julianna White (Ithaca, NY)

4) Welcome by the Chair and announcements

5) Report from External evaluation team (Simon Anderson)

Simon Anderson (IIED), the lead person on the evaluation briefed the ISP on the results of the evaluation.

The reference group for the evaluation consists of: Sirkka Immonen (Internal Evaluation Arrangement - IEA), Charles Rice (CIAT Board), Reiner Wassmann (IRRI), Clare Stirling (CIMMYT), Walter Baethgen (IRI), Ariella Helfgott (Oxford), Manyewu Mutamba (SACAU – farmers organisation), Tobias Baedeker (World Bank), Carmen Thoennissen (SDC), Bruce Campbell (CCAFS).

Documents: CCAFS ISP9 2015/5.1 Evaluation findings

Decisions:

- Noted the external evaluation results.
- The external review report and management response will be disseminated in the next few weeks.

6) Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO (Sophia Huyer)

A report on Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO, was deferred from May 2015 to October 2015. In the 4th ISP meeting, May 2013, a note was made as to the “Relatively low percentage of products/tools/technologies that have been assessed for their gender-differentiated effects or which consider gender”. In October 2014 the importance of gender and social differentiation as cross-cutting issue was ratified. It was also agreed to hire a new gender leader to revisit the gender strategy of CCAFS, reinvigorate the gender network within CCAFS, provide intellectual leadership for the Paris gender meeting, and pay particular attention to ensuring that CCAFS can measure progress towards the gender Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO).

In April 2015 Sophia Huyer started as Gender and Social Inclusion (GSI) Leader as a result of the major programmatic changes made in 2014. Catherine Hill was hired as GSI Program Manager in August 2015.

Gender progress is measured through outcomes and outputs in the CCAFS Planning & Reporting system (P&R). The 2015 version of the system will include additional fields for gender outputs and outcomes. The tabled background paper measure progress in implementing the gender strategy in 4 ways:

1. Percentage of budget allocated to gender-focused activities
2. Percentage of gender and social inclusion-related publications
3. Percentage of activities and outputs addressing gender and social inclusion dimensions
4. Gender and social inclusion in CCAFS tools, products and technologies
5. Organization of gender support and expertise in the programme.

A recent review of gender outputs and projects found that 1) the percentage of gender-focussed publications is very low; and 2) reporting on gender outputs and outcomes has not been systematic. The number of gender-focussed publications (“gender” or “women” in the title) increased from 3 in 2011 to 13 in 2014 – 1 and 5% respectively. The number of gender-focused journal publications was 0 in 2011 and 2012, 1 in 2013, and 4 in 2014 (3%). (Factoring in “social inclusion” increases the percentages to around 30%.) This percentage will increase in the next two years with many publications in process (including journal articles). However it indicates the need for CCAFS to support gender research across the programme.

Data on gender activities in 2013 and 2014 indicates steady progress: of 52 activities, 14 included a gender component (37%). This percentage increased in 2014 to 20 activities of 49, or 41%. Gender outputs and outcomes are difficult to assess before 2013 and data for 2013 and 2014 are not easy to collect, however the current updating of the P&R system will improve this situation. The Gender and Social Inclusion unit will work with flagships and regional programmes to maintain a high level of gender activity.

The first CCAFS Gender Strategy was completed and approved in 2012. In 2015 the process of revising the strategy was begun as part of the Phase II pre-proposal Gender Summary. The CCAFS Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy is in the process of being revised in consultation with the CCAFS gender specialists as suggested by the External Evaluation. CCAFS will undertake research that can inform, catalyze and target CSA solutions to women and other vulnerable groups, increase the control of disadvantaged groups over productive assets and resources (including, e.g., climate information, novel climate finance), and increase participation in decision making (e.g. in local and national climate adaptation strategies).). The second sub-IDO, “technologies that reduce women’s labour and energy expenditure developed and disseminated” will be incorporated where possible. All CCAFS gender-related activities will include in planning and monitoring criteria that workloads of women and youth will not be increased.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP 9/6.1 Progress in the Implementation of the Gender Strategy

CCAFS ISP9/6.2 Presentation: Progress in the Implementation of the Gender Strategy

Decisions:

- Noted progress in developing the revised Gender Strategy and identified gaps in objectives, activities, and assessment.
- Noted progress in reinvigorating the CCAFS gender network
- Noted and appreciated progress to date and increasing improvement in implementing the Gender Strategy
- Requested a report at the next ISP meeting on measuring the gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R system

7) Partnership strategy for CCAFS including the future partnership between Future Earth and CCAFS (Sonja Vermeulen)

Looking back to Phase I and the Extension Phase, CCAFS has built – and maintained – strong partnerships. Partners represent a wide range of stakeholder groups, including farmers’ organisations and private sector bodies. Planning and reporting processes have improved in terms of including partners in project management and tracking their contributions to outputs. Budget allocation and execution to non-CGIAR partners has been stable at around 25%, though Window 1 and Window 2 variability suggest that greater bilateral fund-raising is needed to support partnerships in future. Publications with partners from NARES and academic partners have exceeded targets.

The full Phase II proposal, to be submitted in March 2016, will include a full partnership strategy. Partner consultations are planned to deliver the strategy, including within the GCARD 3 framework. Funding to partners will be 25-30% of total budget. Up to 40 Strategic Partners will participate in a Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC) to meet once per year. Future Earth will remain a primary partner among these Strategic Partners, and will represent all non-CGIAR partners on the Phase II CCAFS Independent Steering Committee. Regional partners may be the priority for the additional places on the PAC.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP9/7.1 Partnership strategy for CCAFS

Decisions:

- Prioritise bilateral fund-raising to support partnerships at the regional level.
- Prioritise regional partners in recruiting up to six additional Strategic Partners for CCAFS Phase II.
- Noted again the recommendation from the EC/IFAD review suggesting that CCAFS convene a stakeholder consultation each year in conjunction with an ISP meeting. For 2015 and 2016, these consultations should be part of the Phase II planning process, including the GCARD 3 process. Looking forward, this stakeholder consultation will be catered for by the PAC.
- Noted need to manage partner and stakeholder expectations with respect to CCAFS funds under Phase II.
- Noted need for additional analysis of partnerships, including documentation of funding to and outcomes by partners

8) Key Strategic issues in the Phase II proposal (Bruce Campbell)

See background paper “CCAFS ISP9/8.1 CCAFS Phase II pre-proposal” for the pre-proposal. CCAFS recently received comments from the ISPC on the pre-proposal (CCAFS ISP9/8.3).

Overall CCAFS did well in the eyes of the ISPC as indicated in the summary table from the ISPC below. Flagship 4 came in for the most criticism. Many of the other recommendations are easily implemented.

	RTB	CCAFS	A4NH	MAIZE	WHEAT	FTA	RAFS	PIM		DCLAS	FISH	WLE	Lvstock
RECOMMENDATION	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments	satisfactory with adjustments		major concerns	major concerns	major concerns	major concerns
Overall Score	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B		C	C	C	C
1. Integral part of Portfolio	A	A	A	B	B	A	B	B		B	B	B	B
2. Theory of Change	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	B		B	B	C	C
5. Governance and Management	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	A		C	C	C	C
6. Flagships	6.1	A	A	B	B	B	B	B		A	B	B	B
	6.2	A	B	A	A	B	A	A		B	B	B	B
	6.3	A	B	B	A	B	A	B		C	C	B	C
	6.4	A	C	B	B	B	C	A		D	C	B	C
	6.5	C		C	B	C	B	B		B		D	C
	6.6	C		C	B		A	B		B		C	D
	6.7						B			B			

We identify five key issues to be considered for the Phase II full proposal.

a) Bilateral budget

Some very different assumptions are being made by the Consortium in relation to the level of bilateral support to CRPs. In the latest vision of funding for Phase II by the Consortium, it was assumed W3 and Bilateral support would be three times that of W1 W2 (3:1). In the pre-proposal CCAFS assumed 1:1 for the first three years and 2:1 for the second three years of Phase II. CCAFS will have to scale up expectations for W3 & Bilateral if it is to achieve 3:1.

Given the impending budget cuts in W1 and W2 funds (see next issue), if indeed we can get a 3:1 ratio, then CCAFS will be as large as before but with a lower W1 W2 proportion. On the negative side is the fact that the PMC has seen that large amounts of bilateral do not necessarily lead to a coherent strategic program. The challenge will be getting high levels of bilateral but maintaining focus.

Key questions:

- i) Should CCAFS assume the higher levels of bilateral and thus leave the current structure and Flagships in place?
- ii) Should CCAFS make cuts to the structure and Flagships, and aim to raise funds around fewer topics?
- iii) How does CCAFS maintain coherence and strategic focus in the face of large bilateral funding?

b) Budget size

We have estimated a 40% reduction in W1 and W2 funds for CCAFS in 2016. The Consortium believes that 2016 will be a gap year for the CGIAR as it waits to start Phase II. However the PMC would not be surprised if funding to CCAFS W1 and W2 goes down by 50% in Phase II from its level in 2015. The current pre-proposal has assumed a level of funding approximately that of 2015. If there is a major W1 W2 budget reduction, then we do need to rethink what is feasible. The Fund Council may give very explicit instructions on what has to be cut, but given the time pressures in the period November-March we need to start to consider some options:

- A. Include fewer regions in CCAFS. The most likely to be dropped from a CGIAR mission perspective would be LAM and SEA, though these have a specific niche in relation to the mitigation Flagship and its outcomes. We have excellent successes in countries

like India and Colombia – however, they are not high priority in terms of the CGIAR mission. They could possibly be dropped, or only be maintained if there is bilateral support to support them.

- B. Make cost-savings in Regional Program Leader budgets by combining African regional programs and Asian regional programs into single programs for Africa and Asia. Alternatively, significantly decreasing the budgets to all Regions and expecting greater fund-raising.
- C. Drop one of the Flagships. Probably the first to go would be the policy one, with policy issues then being mainstreamed in the other Flagships.
- D. RPLs and FLs have been productive in terms of outcomes and outputs – thus providing cost savings through cutting their budgets seems rather short term. Thus the other option would be to drop some Centers and focus on fewer sub-sectors. The negative aspect of this strategy would be the shift to less integrated approaches.
- E. Some cost savings could be made in the coordinating unit, by reducing the number of positions. This does come with fewer resources for coordination and global partnerships which have been successes for CCAFS.
- F. Most advice for cutting may come from the Fund Council’s comments on thematic coverage. What topics should be cut and could be done elsewhere? Some possibilities include the following CoAs (with the assumption that these are taken up elsewhere in the CGIAR portfolio):
 - 1)CoA 1.7: Foresight, models and metrics for climate sensitive breeding. CCAFS had difficulty in getting traction on breeding strategies in Phase I. However the ISPC comments that this is an innovative CoA.
 - 2)CoA 2.4 Early warning and decision systems for food security planning and response to climate shocks
 - 3)CoA 3.4 Supply chain governance to avoid deforestation AND/OR CoA 3.5 Opportunities for mitigation through efficient and resilient food production systems
 - 4) CoA 4.4 Food and nutrition security futures under climate change

Key question:

- i) How should budget cuts be applied to CCAFS?

c) Level of integration

A major change from Phase I to Phase II is the level of integration expected. CCAFS is one of four Integrative-CRPs and is expected to interact with all the Agri-Food CRPs as well as with the other Integrative CRPs. In some ways the challenge may not be too great, as CCAFS already works with all the Centers. In addition, the Center scientists working on CCAFS often also work in other CRPs or have close colleagues in their Center who work on other CRPs. Thus, in fact, CCAFS is already working closely with other CRPs. What we need to do is formalise the connections at the CRP management levels and makes sure there is a systematic approach to CRP collaboration rather than relying on how individuals relate to other CRPs.

To this end CCAFS has proposed “Learning Platforms” (amongst many CRPs) and “Twinned Flagships” (with 1-2 other CRPs). Figure 5.2 in Annex 5 of the proposal shows the proposed Learning Platforms and Twinned Flagships (in follow up discussion it has been proposed to increase the scope of the insurance learning platform to cover additional material from Flagship 2, namely the climate information services work). It is unclear whether CCAFS should

have these kinds of “docking stations” or whether the whole of CCAFS should be a docking station. The ISPC comments favourably on these docking stations.

Key questions:

- i) Does the structure of CCAFS with CoAs, Learning Platforms and Twinned Flagships make sense, or should the vision be that the entirety of CCAFS is a learning platform? (Unfortunately the term Platform has been applied to very small entities in the new portfolio, e.g. big data platform, gender platform, and so it may not be appropriate to call the whole of CCAFS a platform)
- ii) Does CCAFS have the appropriate number of platforms – not too many and not too few?

d) Thematic issues

The PMC suspects the bulk of the feedback from the Fund Council will be related to thematic issues, boundaries and duplication. The one that has given the PMC plenty of discussion is the relationship between the Poverty, Institutions and Markets (PIM) CRP and Flagship 4 of CCAFS. However, a closer analysis shows the distinct focus (see background paper CCAFS ISP9/8.2 Complementarities between the coverage of policy-related work in Flagship 4 of CCAFS and PIM). The PIM proposal contains very little on climate change, and their clusters seem to be built more around disciplines – the CCAFS clusters appear to be much more integrative / multi-disciplinary.

Key questions:

- i) Are there any thematic issues in the pre-proposal that need the attention of the PMC?
- ii) Does the analysis of the PIM-CCAFS relationships in the background paper and the FTA-CCAFS relationships in the pre-proposal (Annex 5) provide sufficient evidence for the respective roles of the CRPs?

e) Governance

The governance model proposed for Phase II follows closely the current governance arrangements, but with a few differences:

- i) A Partner Advisory Committee (PAC) is proposed made up of all the Strategic Partners (see page 9 of the proposal for the partners). This will meet once per year and feed into the ISC (note the name change from ISP to ISC) via the Future Earth ex officio member on the ISC.
- ii) The DG of the Lead Center now represents the Lead Center, not the CIAT Board member (this change is made to meet the guidelines on governance given for the pre-proposal)
- iii) Another DG is on the ISC, selected by the Centers participating in CCAFS
- iv) Only one physical meeting is planned per year.

One aspect of the guidelines was not followed. It is stated that all Strategic Partners should be represented on the governance body, meaning all the DGs of the large Centers in CCAFS plus external partners. This was impossible in the case of CCAFS given the number of CGIAR Centers and external strategic partners and thus the PMC proposal for having representatives.

Key questions:

- i) Is it workable to have a PAC with representation by Future Earth on the ISC?
- ii) Is the governance model appropriate?

Documents:

CCAFS ISP9/8.1 CCAFS Phase II pre-proposal

CCAFS ISP9/8.2 Complementarities between the coverage of policy-related work in Flagship 4 of CCAFS and PIM

CCAFS ISP9/8.3 ISPC Commentary on the Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Pre-proposal (2017-2022)

Decisions:

- Endorsed and congratulated the decisions taken by the PMC for the pre-proposal,.
- Requested additional analyses for CCAFS core team to consider in their Phase 2 budget planning:
 - a. Analysis of the estimated savings potential and project impacts of stated budget cut scenarios
 - b. Analysis of potential fundraising options, and the personnel needs and timeline to conduct the fundraising
 - c. Analysis of win-win opportunities for potential budget savings from collaboration and partnerships with other CRPs or combining programs
 - d. Analyses to include how savings and revenue scenarios play out over a three-year time frame
- Endorsed proposed approach in level of integration, thematic issues and governance.
- Noted that advice from ISPC and IEA is thorough, but at times conflicting. The ISP supports management in responding and reconciling recommendations as management sees fit.
- Noted need to investigate CG policy regarding penalties to centres from reporting bilateral funds to CRPs.

9) Closure (Brian Keating)

Videoconferencing system posed multiple technical problems and did not offer functionality to chat or signal chair. Despite this, participants accomplished the meeting's objectives. The next ISP meeting will be a physical meeting.

#2 email consultation
22 January

9) ISP report to the Lead Center Board

The Director, Chair of ISP and ISP ex-officio member from the CIAT Board all made presentations to the CIAT Board. This covered:

(a) Budget 2015. The late notification of a further 16% budget cut and that budget uncertainty remains as the most important risk to program management;

(b) Phase II proposal. CCAFS pre-proposal was well received with minimal comments for major revisions, but that the biggest change may be a budget reduction; The ISP was happy with the progress made on the proposal and noted that advice from ISPC and IEA is thorough, but at times conflicting. The ISP supports management in responding and reconciling recommendations as management sees fit.

(c) Performance rating from Consortium. CCAFS performance was ranked highest with one other program, and this gave CCAFS an advantage relative to other CRPs in relation to the budget 2016.

(d) Recent major products and engagement activities.

(e) External evaluation. That this was delayed, but indications so far were that CCAFS had few issues to deal with.

(f) Notification that Future Earth ex officio will step down.

(g) Governance in Phase II. That some changes would be made in relation to the guidelines for Phase 2 from the consortium.

(h) Progress in the implementation of the Gender Strategy, including means of measuring progress on the gender IDO.

(i) Partnership strategy for CCAFS including the future partnership between Future Earth and CCAFS. The ISP has been particularly interested in the degree to which national partners are engaged in CCAFS and has requested more details on budgets.

(j) 2016 CCAFS Business Plan and Budget. A budget scenario with a 38% cut was presented, with a final workplan and budget to be circulated to ISP once the budget figures were clear. The CIAT Board supported the approach being taken to the 2016 workplan and budget.

Decisions:

(a) The ISP notes the update from the CIAT Board Meeting

(b) The ISP requests that the Plan of Work and Budget for 2016 be circulated to the Chair for approval (this is delayed due to lateness of notification of 2016 budget; and need by Centers to then provide input).

10) Options for making budget and program cuts in CCAFS in light of the likely Phase II budget

CCAFS will undergo a budget cut in Phase II, estimated to be 50% for Window 1 and Window 2 (W1 W2) funds (for 2017, by comparison to the 2015 budget¹). However, the Fund Council/Consortium Office assumes an increase in Window 3 and Bilateral Funds (which are mostly controlled by Centers). If we assume we can achieve this increase, then for the total budget there is a c. 15% reduction from 2015, or 21% down from the pre-proposal. A future agenda item will examine fund-raising and the incentives to be put in place to achieve W3 and Bilateral targets.

In 2014, CCAFS reorganized the program in preparation for the Extension Phase and Phase II, with all projects in regions inter-linked to impact pathways. Thus, we have gone a long way to having a strategic budget allocation. But we now need to apply cuts to the budget and make savings of c. US\$ 20.8 million compared to 2015 operations. This agenda item focuses on Phase II (2017 onwards) but the intention is to make the 2016 budget allocation consistent with the 2017 proposals, so that as much continuity, where appropriate, can be maintained.

This agenda item tackles the generic issues – the costs and benefits of different options for budget cuts. The next agenda item makes a budget proposal for Phase II, based on the selected options. Key questions include:

- a) How can the W1 W2 budget cut (relative to 2015 allocations) be allocated amongst different components of CCAFS?
- b) Given the overall budget cut, what programmatic content needs to be cut?

We have analysed five scenarios, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive:

1. Reducing the Coordinating Unit
2. Reducing the number of Flagships, including Gender and Social Inclusion
3. Reducing Regional Operations
4. Reducing the Projects in Regions/Flagships
5. Reducing the Centers/Center Contact Points

The detailed analysis of various options is given in the background paper (see CCAFS ISP9 10.1 Background Paper: Options for making budget and program cuts in CCAFS).

The current operating model for CCAFS, in particular the coherence and strategic direction provided by Flagships, and the integration, partnerships and facilitating of outcomes by Regional teams, is regarded as successful, as highlighted by the CRP-Commissioned External Evaluation (by Andrew Ash) and the External Evaluation. Strong regional programs are critical for the success of CCAFS. These programs have built strong partnerships for outcomes and impact, hence would

¹ In doing this comparison the Window 3 funds from EU IFAD to CCAFS are included in the analysis, as these funds have been used as core funds to the functioning of CCAFS. The 2015 figures are as at Oct 2015 (pre the late 2015 16.45% cut).

need strong support for at least the first three years of Phase II. At the end of the three years there should be critical reflection on their results. Sub-regions are very different in terms of population; number, size and diversity of countries; concentration of hunger, under-nutrition, poverty; access to natural resources; and vulnerability to climate change. Hence, merging all of Africa in a single region and all of Asia in another may prove counterproductive. Therefore that operating model should be maintained. Given the new focus in the CGIAR on (i) CCAFS as an integrating program and (ii) country/site integration, the model can be further strengthened, through Flagships playing a major role in integration with other CRPs, and Regions providing the CGIAR with quick wins in country/site integration. In this model, the Coordinating Unit has played a key role, facilitating the matrix model and linking to global processes to ensure global outcomes.

Partial budget cuts should be made to the Coordinating Unit, with the understanding that this will result in some cuts in one or more of: global visibility, outcomes, global synthesis papers, data management and Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). Some of the Coordinating Unit functions can be shifted to Flagships making the functions more demand-driven and better linked to Flagship impact pathways. One of these functions – namely global policy synthesis and engagement – should be taken up partially under the Learning Platform on “Partnerships for Scaling up CSA” that links to all Flagships and other CRPs, operating in a similar manner to the Gender and Social Inclusion Learning Platform.

Documents:

CCAFS ISP9 10.1 Background paper: Options for making budget and program cuts in CCAFS

Decisions:

- a) The current four Flagships should be maintained, but each will have to be downsized, including reducing the number of Clusters of Activities (CoAs) in each (compared to the numbers presented in the pre-proposal).
- b) The Gender and Social Inclusion Leader position and budget should be maintained. As previously discussed, the ISP and External Evaluation team expect a significant scaling up of work and results on gender.
- c) The coordinating unit budget can be partially cut on the understanding that some of the current functions will also be trimmed. The current global engagement work should be shifted (and downscaled) to the cross-program learning platform on Partnerships for Scaling up CSA.
- d) The current five regions should be maintained, but each will have to be downsized. The ISP requests a report back on the 2016 experience of only having one Regional Program Leader in Africa (covering East and West Africa). Provision in the proposal should be made for changes in regions after the first three years of Phase II, as previously discussed by the ISP.
- e) Maintaining the current functioning while also making budget cuts of nearly 50% in W1 W2 needs to be done through a project-by-project analysis and function-by-function analysis. It is estimated that Center projects will need to be cut by 50-60% (in terms of W1 W2). Project cuts should be applied based on the relative strategic role in the portfolio, likelihood of delivery of outcomes and other strategic considerations.

- f) It is expected that most Centers, if not all, will play a role in CCAFS. Center Contact Points should facilitate the linking of CCAFS activities to activities of Centers in other CRPs.
- g) All participating Centers are expected to contribute to the CCAFS fund raising strategy called for in the Phase II proposal. The Flagship and Regional Leaders will work with Centre Contacts and senior Centre scientists to seek to mitigate the cuts in W1/W2 funds via securing W3 and bilateral project funds that align with CCAFS strategy. This might include additional donor support for CoAs or targeted donor sponsorship for regional programs. ISP would like to see a report on W3 fund raising as a standing item on future agendas.
- h) An overview of the approved budget cuts are as follows (see further details in the following agenda item).
- i) The management team should consider the comments made on the titles for Flagships and CoAs to ensure they convey the content, and are sufficiently distinct to outside audiences.

Summary Table – indicative budget savings of W1/W2 funds (note W3 and Bilateral funding should be sought to reduce the impacts of these savings)

Budget item	Indicative saving (\$ million p.a.)
Coordinating Unit Budget	1.5
Re-configured cross program learning platforms	1.5
Flagship Program Leader budgets	1.5
Regional Leader Budgets	3.0
Research Projects in Centres	13.5
Centre contact points reconfigured	(no saving: marginal budget increase +0.1)
Total potential saving of W1/W2	21.0
Target to be saved	20.8

11) Proposed Program and Budget cuts for Phase II and implications for 2016

For Phase II, the overall budget (inclusive of W3 Bilateral) of CCAFS is assumed to be 15% lower (compared to 2015) and 21% lower than in the pre-proposal. Proposed targets in the pre-proposal will be reduced accordingly.

a) Proposed programmatic changes

Initial ideas for programmatic changes are as follows, with the new proposed structure in Table 1:

(a) The Cluster of Activity (CoA) on “Foresight, models and metrics for climate-sensitive breeding” under the old Flagship 1 (F1) (note the Flagship numbers have changed as a result of a request from other CRP Directors) will be downscaled and migrated to what was Flagship 4 (now the new F1) and be combined with the CoA “Ex-ante evaluation and decision support for climate-smart options” (Table 1).

(b) The old Flagship 2 (Now F4) will downscale the work on "Food security planning and response management in the face of climate shocks" (was CoA 2.4), and consolidate remaining work under what was CoA 2.4 with CoA 2.1: "Climate information and seasonal agricultural prediction for risk management."

(c) Flagship 3 will consolidate downscaled activities in the old CoA 3.4 "Supply chain governance to avoid deforestation" and old 3.5 "Opportunities for mitigation through efficient and resilient food production systems" under CoA 3.3 "Identifying priorities and options for low emissions development." CoA 3.4 "Supply chain governance to avoid deforestation" and 3.5 Opportunities for mitigation through efficient and resilient food production systems under CoA 3.3 "Identifying priorities and options for low emissions development."

(d) The old Flagship 4 will combine two clusters of activities to sharpen the focus of priority setting and foresight work (this will also include the climate-sensitive breeding CoA mentioned above). This will also pool resources more effectively to address the System-Level Outcome target on nutrition. The clusters on "Improved national climate change planning and implementation environments" and "Governance and institutions for climate-smart food systems" will be combined given the reduction in areas that can be covered.

Table 1: Proposed Flagships and Clusters of Activity in Phase II. Note the proposed new order of Flagship numbers (explicit learning platforms across CRPs in italics). Titles are still being discussed.

Flagship	F1. Scenarios and Policies for Climate-Smart Agriculture (previously Flagship 4)	F2. Climate- Smart Practices and Portfolios (previously Flagship 1)	F3. Low-Emissions Development (previously Flagship 3)	F4. Climate Information Services and Climate-informed safety nets (previously Flagship 2)
Cross-cutting	A. CSA, gender and social inclusion B. Partnerships for Scaling up CSA			
Cluster of Activities (CoAs)	1.1 <i>Ex-ante evaluation and decision support for climate-smart options</i> (note this includes climate-smart breeding) 1.2 Policies and institutions to bring CSA to scale 1.3 Food and nutrition security futures under climate change (reduced by 1 CoA)	2.1 <i>Participatory evaluation of CSA practices and portfolios in CSVs</i> 2.2 Evidence, investment planning and application domains for CSA technologies and practices 2.3 Equitable sub-national adaptation planning and implementation 2.4 Incentives and innovative finance	3.1 Quantifying GHG emissions from smallholder systems 3.2 <i>Identifying priorities and options for low-emissions development</i> 3.3 Policy, incentives and finance for scaling up low emissions practices (reduced by 2 CoA)	4.1 Climate information and early warning for risk management 4.2 Rural climate information and advisory services 4.3 <i>Weather-related agricultural insurance products and programs</i> 4.4 Guidance and evidence for

		for scaling CSA up and out (reduced by 3 CoA)		climate service investment (reduced by 1 CoA)
--	--	---	--	---

b) Proposed 2017 budget

New budget proposals have been arrived at based on a detailed consideration of where cuts can be made, and what is essential to remain; examining each function in CCAFS and considering each project. Detailed budgeting still needs to be completed, so further smaller shifts are likely. The relative allocation amongst Flagships as in the pre-proposal has been maintained with some minor shifts in relative proportions. The allocation amongst regions are similar, given there is limited evidence for greater or lesser budget to be allocated to specific regions.

It is proposed that c. US\$ 1.5 million per annum can be cut from the Coordinating Unit budget, with the understanding that this will result in some cuts in global visibility and ambitions in terms of good practice for data management, MEL etc.

Two cross-program Learning Platforms are proposed, one on CSA, Gender and Social Inclusion (budget allocation US\$ 750k per annum, with additional funds mainstreamed into many other budget lines) and the other on Partnerships for Scaling up CSA (budget allocation US\$ 300k per annum). This represents a decrease of US\$ 1.5 million relative to 2015 budgets. In relation to the latter, CCAFS will make its investments in impact pathways beyond research more explicit, and more measurable for performance evaluation. This Learning Platform will provide opportunities for all the CRPs and all CCAFS Flagships to maximise policy-related outcomes from research, and provide a forum across all CRPs and Flagships for pulling together scaling up experiences and results. This cross-cutting learning platform will coordinate among the Regional Program Leaders, Centers and CGIAR communicators to deliver a strategic body of policy-oriented activities, outputs and outcomes at all levels. It will aim to position the entire CGIAR as the leading global research organization for developing country food systems and climate change, with strong links to specific CCAFS impact pathways.

Flagship Leader budgets will be reduced about 30%, thus saving c. US\$ 1.3 million per annum. Flagship Leaders will be expected to raise significant resources to fill the budget gaps. Key budget needs relate to CCAFS as an integrative program, so budget needs to be allocated to the Learning Platforms that each Flagship Leader must facilitate. In addition, investment needs to be made in key strategic research areas (e.g. involving links with the climate science community) and in fostering global impact pathways (e.g. research on creative finance for CSA with the World Bank).

Regional Program Leader budgets will be reduced c. 40%, thus saving c. US\$ 3 million per annum. The Regional Program Leaders will re-orient to a stronger focus on integrative engagement activities to achieve impact pathways, working together under the coordination of the cross-cutting Policy Engagement on CSA theme. Regional Program Leaders will be expected to raise significant resources to fill the budget gaps. As for Flagship Leaders, key budget needs relate to CCAFS as an integrative program, so budget needs to be allocated to coordination with other CRPs, from site to national levels.

Total project budgets will be cut c. 60%, thus saving c. US\$ 12 million per annum. This will involve eliminating many projects completely and reducing the budgets of others. The remaining projects will be redesigned to fit the new budget realities and the new portfolio. The remaining projects will, where appropriate, link to other CRPs, including through co-investment, to build CCAFS-other CRP linkages.

The roles of Contact Points will be reconfigured by reducing their project management roles (planning and reporting) and focussing on more strategic roles: (a) delivery of 1-2 strategic CCAFS products from each Center per year (with good connections to the other CRPs being implemented by the Center); (b) linking the climate change work of the whole Center under all CRPs into the impact pathways provided by the CCAFS Learning Platform on Policy Engagement on CSA (c) helping raise the visibility and reach of collaborations between CCAFS and other CRPs, and (d) helping the Center with fund-raising strategies for CCAFS.

The budget allocation to CCAFS is proposed as in Table 2.

c) W1 and W2 fund allocation by Center and function

The Table shows the W1 W2 allocations by Center and functions. Final W3 and Bilateral numbers are still awaited. The 2016 numbers are shown in relationship to 2015 figures. The 2015 numbers are those before a further cut was made of 16.54% across the board and exclude any funds to Centers that are regarded as potentially one-off (e.g. funds from DFID that provided extra allocations for delivery of products in 2015, "inter-Centre transfers" from regional or flagship leaders to Centers for 2015 tasks, "bridging funds" used to phase out previous projects). The overall budget cut is 43%, applied as 46% to projects at Centers and with main partners, 36% to Flagship Leaders (who have borne the brunt of previous cuts), 47% to regional program leaders and 33% to cross-cutting issues and management and governance (where there are significant items that cannot be cut further). The project-by-project and function-by-function analysis leads to a differential cut for Centers, ranging from 2% for the Centers that cannot decrease anymore (without exiting from CCAFS) to 95% (for a Center that did not lead any projects and was only a participant in other Centre projects).

CCAFS 2016 - CONFIRMED UPDATED W1W2 BUDGET - JAN 2016

Summary by Center

Elaborated by Julian Rivera (CIAT-CCAFS)

UNIT	Projects at Centers & Main Partners			Flagship Leaders Budgets (synthesis, gap-filling, integration, outcome facilitation)			Regional Program Leaders (site to regional CSA integration, synthesis, gap-filling, facilitation)			Cross-cutting research and engagement; Management & governance (inc. communications, data management, MEL)			*A 2016 (V)
	*Adjusted 2015 CGIAR Fund (W1+W2)	Latest Budget (W1&2) - Jan 2016	Last Cut %	*Adjusted 2015 CGIAR Fund (W1+W2)	Latest Budget (W1&2) - Jan 2016	Last Cut %	*Adjusted 2015 CGIAR Fund (W1+W2)	Latest Budget (W1&2) - Jan 2016	Last Cut %	*Adjusted 2015 CGIAR Fund (W1+W2)	Latest Budget (W1&2) - Jan 2016	Last Cut %	
	23,462	12,671	46%	4,528	2,897	36%	7,871	4,201	47%	5,889	3,932	33%	
AFRICARICE	28	28	2%										
BIOVERSITY	2,497	1,067	57%										
CIAT	4,062	2,311	43%	889	755	36%	1,455	630	57%	3,337	2,274	32%	
CIFOR	813	372	54%										
CIMMYT	2,747	1,177	57%				1,869	840	55%				
CIP	523	28	95%										
ICARDA	28	28	2%										
ICRAF	3,226	1,747	46%										
ICRISAT	1,591	753	53%				1,451	968	33%				
IFPRI	1,984	924	53%										
IITA	855	561	34%										
ILRI	1,777	736	59%	1,468	762	48%	1,516	994	34%				
IRRI	1,284	658	49%				1,580	769	51%				
IWMI	1,211	886	27%										
WORLD FISH	570	427	25%										
IRI-Columbia	264	268	-1%	927	695	25%							
Wageningen	-	700	N/A										
Vermont				1,245	685	45%							
Copenhagen										1,805	1,016	44%	
WISAT										746	641	14%	
				This 2015 budget is based on the budget before the final 16.45% cut, and excludes inter-Center transfers, additional DFID contributions and bridging funds						CIAT: management & governance Copenhagen: Global Policy research & engagement (e.g. UNFCCC, WBSCD) WISAT: Gender and Social Inclusion Le			

d) Implications for 2016

The 2016 program and budget also require a cut (down to US\$ 23.7 million). 2016 can thus be viewed as a significant step towards 2017. It is proposed that the Plan of Work and Budget for 2016 will thus be in line with what will eventuate in 2017.

Decisions:

- a) The ISP supports the proposals for the Phase II budget, and requests that a finalized budget be sent to the ISP Chair for final approval, inclusive of W3 Bilateral funds once Centers and partners have submitted detailed budget estimates.
- b) The ISP requests that the 2016 budget allocation, which also requires a cut relative to 2015, be constructed as a step towards the 2017 budget.

Table 2. Proposed W1 W2 budget distribution amongst Flagships, Regions and Management

		Flagship 1	Flagship 2	Flagship 3	Flagship 4	TOTAL	Comments
		Priorities and Policies for Climate-Smart Agriculture	Climate-Smart Practices and Portfolios	Low-Emissions Development	Climate Information Services and Climate-informed safety nets		
Global budgets (Flagship Leader, inc. Learning Platform and global projects)		1,310	1,200	1,450	1,050	5,010	
Regional Programs (Leader and project budgets)	LAM	542	693	850	565	2,650	
	WA	381	1,242	60	966	2,650	
	EA	703	976	1,017	205	2,900	
	SA	381	1,506	221	542	2,650	
	SEA	722	949	882	697	3,250	
Sub-totals		4,040	6,566	4,480	4,024	19,110	
Management and governance						1,890	Inc data management, MEL
Total						21,000	

12) Prioritization of items for the coming ISP meetings

The following topics, previously prioritized by the ISP or emerging from this email consultation, should be presented at the 2016 meeting or later meetings:

- Measuring the gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R (Planning and Reporting) system.
- Partnerships: Funding to different partner types and contribution of partners to outcomes.
- Fund raising strategy and incentives to raise bilateral and W3 funds.
- Performance-based management in relation to fund allocation.
- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture and Climate-Smart Villages, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy.
- Capacity building and sustainability in local situations/settings
- Internal competitive fund for exploring innovative ideas
- Flagship 1 priority setting paper
- Paper examining the relative focus on different Flagships; and relative distribution of work amongst regions, as an input to future priority setting; paper to be based on solicited expert input
- Institutions and incentives for low emissions development
- Linking knowledge and action: status and outlook
- Progress in Flagship 2 in getting synergies across CGIAR Centers
- Human resources capacity development framework for climate change, including curricula
- Role of ISP in W3/Bilateral fund raising

Decisions:

To agree that the following topics be prioritised in the 2016 meeting:

- Science frame for Climate-Smart Agriculture and Climate-Smart Villages, linking to aspects such as sustainable intensification and green economy
- Measuring the gender and youth IDOs using the revised P&R (Planning and Reporting) system.
- Partnerships: Funding to different partner types and contribution of partners to outcomes.
- Fund raising strategy and incentives to raise bilateral and W3 funds.
- Performance-based management in relation to fund allocation.

13) Seeking suggestions for a Future Earth ex officio member

As the Future Earth ex Officio member has stepped down from the ISP, a replacement needs to be sought. Future Earth will be approached to nominate a replacement, but CCAFS could also make suggestions, should we have any suggestions.

Decisions:

- a) To request members to send suggestions of individuals from the global change community to the Director and Chair for consideration by Future Earth
- b) To request the Director to approach Future Earth for their suggestion as to a replacement on the ISP

14) Future meetings, including date and place for the 10th meeting

Due to budget constraints the ISP decided to have only one in-person meeting in 2015. As the CCAFS budget in 2016 will be reduced by up to 40% it has been decided to continue with only one in-person meeting in 2016.

Decisions:
 To agree to have one in-person meeting in 2016 in September in Senegal
 To request the CCAFS Coordination Unit to propose dates and send a doodle poll to ISP members

15) Discussing results of the self-assessment forms from the May ISP meeting

The ISP self-assessment from the May ISP meeting shows overall good results, where ISP members rate performance as mostly good or very good:

1. Please rate the IPS's performance against its responsibilities according to the ISP Terms of Reference

	Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
Ensuring independence of the programmatic directions of CCAFS and setting overall programmatic priorities				3	5	
Providing advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees regarding the annual business plan and budget allocations submitted by the Program Director				3	5	
Approving the activity plan and budget of each Program Participant			3	0	3	1
Advise the Lead Centre on extraordinary actions when required, such as modification of a Program Participant Grant				3	3	2

CCAFS ISP9/Draft minutes

or termination of a Program Participant Agreement (PPA) if the Program Participant is in breach of its responsibilities.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Please rate the ISP's overall effectiveness in fulfilling its responsibilities

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			5	3	

3. Please rate the relevance of the agenda for this ISP meeting

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			2	6	

4. Please rate the performance of the ISP Chair in running this ISP meeting

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			1	6	1

5. Please rate the ISP Chair's collaboration with the CIAT Board of Trustees and Director General

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			1	1	6

6. Please rate the performance of the Program Director and PMC in providing timely and relevant information for ISP decisions

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			1	7	

7. Please rate the performance of the CIAT and Future Earth ex-officio members of the ISP in facilitating information exchange and programmatic alignment between CCAFS and their programs

CCAFS ISP9/Draft minutes

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
			1	6	1

8. Please rate the usefulness of the field trip at this ISP meeting and provide any comments for future field trips

Very poor	poor	neutral	good	Very good	Don't know
				6	2

Proposed decision:

To take note of the ISP self-assessment

16) Any other business

CCAFS ISP9/Draft minutes

List of documents:

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.1 Minutes from the 8th CCAFS ISP meeting (confidential)

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.2 Status on Follow-ups from Previous Meeting

CCAFS ISP9/1.2.3 List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCAFS ISP9/3.1 CCAFS Internal Performance Management Indicators

CCAFS ISP9 2015/5.1 Evaluation findings

CCAFS ISP9/6.1 Progress in the Implementation of the Gender Strategy

CCAFS ISP9/6.2 Presentation: Progress in the Implementation of the Gender Strategy

CCAFS ISP9/7.1 Partnership strategy for CCAFS

CCAFS ISP9/8.1 CCAFS Phase II pre-proposal

CCAFS ISP9/8.2 Complementarities between the coverage of policy-related work in Flagship 4 of CCAFS and PIM

CCAFS ISP9/8.3 ISPC Commentary on the Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Pre-proposal (2017-2022)