



## The CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework Action Plan October, 2012

---

*Prepared by the CGIAR Consortium Office<sup>1</sup>*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Process proposed for the development of the SRF Action Plan .....	3
3. Prioritization.....	4
a. System Level IDOs .....	4
b. CRP Level IDOs .....	5
4. Performance Management.....	8
5. Partnerships .....	11
6. Cyclical Updating of the SRF .....	12
a. Incorporating a Foresight Dimension into the SRF .....	12
b. Cross-cutting issues.....	15
c. CGIAR Competencies and Comparative Advantage.....	16
d. Regional strategies.....	17
e. Analysis and monitoring capacity .....	17
f. Research Support.....	18
7. Immediate steps to initiate development of the Action Plan.....	18

---

<sup>1</sup> A zero draft was prepared by Consortium Office in July and circulated for comments. The draft released 31 August benefitted from comments and inputs from ISPC, GFAR Executive Secretary, the Gender and Agriculture Network, several CRPs and Consortium Members as well as a Working Group of CGIAR Science Leaders. This revised October draft benefitted from feedback through an e-feedback and e-consultation process conducted in September 2012.

## 1. Introduction

The *ad hoc* CGIAR Funders' Forum 2011 endorsed the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF, February 20, 2011 version). At the same time the Forum requested the Consortium to develop an Action Plan to address the issues raised by the Forum and provide a timetable for its implementation. The second Funders' Forum (November 2012) will review and hopefully approve the proposed action plan.

The main issues raised by the *ad hoc* Funders Forum are:

1. Including a forward looking, dynamic and foresight dimension in the SRF;
2. Including a process for setting priorities among the different CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs);
3. Identifying metrics to measure success in the implementation of the SRF and that connect the performance of the CRPs to the System Level Outcomes (SLOs).

The above three substantive issues form three main components of the action plan. The Funders' Forum also noted that ISPC could usefully contribute to the process of addressing these issues, and that the SRF would need to be revisited on a regular basis.

On request of the CGIAR Consortium, ISPC developed a White Paper on priority setting<sup>2</sup>, with the following recommendations, accepted by the CGIAR Consortium, for steps to be included in the Action Plan to revise the SRF:

1. At the SRF level, development of a prioritized list of Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) with appropriate scale and aggregation, which are logically linked to the four SLOs;
2. At the CRP level, specification of IDOs at appropriate scale and focus for the proposed research outcomes, which provide pathways linking CRP research outcomes to the four SLOs;
3. Prioritization of research within each CRP and development of a value proposition to address the SLOs through the selected IDOs;
4. Decisions at the SRF level on highest priority target domains in terms of geographic areas, agroecosystems and major commodity-based systems based on consensus definitions of parameters and metrics that can be used to benchmark and monitor poverty, hunger, nutrition and natural resources;
5. Guidance at the SRF level on indicative size of the CGIAR research portfolio for research targeting each IDO;
6. Development of performance contracts that reflect the CRP prioritized research proposals;

---

<sup>2</sup> ISPC, Strengthening Strategy and Results Framework through prioritization, June 22, 2012

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

7. Updating the SRF with respect to: (i) analysis of the external agricultural research and development environment including scenarios regarding the future and drawing from strategic foresight and trends analyses; (ii) analysis of the CGIAR's competencies and comparative advantages as they evolve and in relation to existing and new partners in research and for up- and out-scaling of research outcomes; (iii) defining CGIAR's strategies in different regions; (iv) installation of data gathering and synthesis capacity and agreement on consistency regarding data and metrics; and (v) the rationale and role of the CGIAR in strengthening national capacity.

In many ways, the ISPC White Paper should be read as the companion volume to this document. Concretely, the Consortium intends to implement these recommendations as follows, through three concrete sets of activities:

Recommendations 1, 2 and 3: **Prioritization** at two levels, implemented as follows:

- System Level: "top-down" development of IDOs linked to the SLOs – as well as quantified expressions that indicate the impact ambition level for each – by the Consortium in close collaboration with ISPC, IFPRI, external advisors and CGIAR stakeholders.
- CRP Level: "bottom-up" development of IDOs and associated value propositions by the CRPs, negotiated with a group of representative stakeholders and investors.

Recommendations 4, 5 and 6: Implemented by the Consortium through development of a system for CRP **Performance Management** that supports resource allocation decisions, in line with the priorities identified, to maximize impact and value for money.

Recommendation 7: **Cyclical updating** of the SRF to adapt to changes in the external environment (foresight), the internal CGIAR competencies and comparative advantages as well as regional, analysis and capacity strengthening strategies. The Consortium has added a number of additional elements that will be part and parcel of the cyclical SRF updating, outlined in this document.

The Consortium is adding one more element to this set, that deserves significant attention, and that is the nature and quality of partnerships of the CRP portfolio, both inside and outside the group of CGIAR members.

These four key elements: (1) prioritization, (2) performance management, (3) partnerships and (4) cyclical updating are described in subsequent sections, immediately following a short outline of the process proposed for development of the SRF Action Plan.

The Consortium proposes to update the SRF in 2013 with all actions undertaken through the summer of 2013, leading to the **2013 SRF Update**, and thereafter update the SRF every two years.

## 2. Process proposed for the development of the SRF Action Plan

The Consortium Board (CB) is ultimately responsible for this Action Plan. It has the oversight of the whole process, including its implementation, after approval, by next Funders Forum. The Consortium Office (CO) drafts versions of the Action Plan for CB approval. As described in

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

section 2, all drafts submitted to the CB will have received inputs from the CRPs, the Centres, GFAR (and partners through GFAR) and some interested donors.

A Working Group (WG2<sup>3</sup>) has been formed from among the CGIAR Science Leaders (DDGs Research and CRP leaders) that is also contributing to the development of the SRF Action Plan. Details of the consultation is presented in Annex 1.

### 3. Prioritization

As outlined above, and described in detail in ISPC's White Paper on Prioritization, prioritization is proposed at two levels:

- a top-down process at system level that translates the four dimensions where the CGIAR aims to have impact, i.e. food insecurity, rural poverty, malnutrition and ecosystem services, into concrete IDOs; and
- a bottom-up process at CRP level that expresses IDOs that are the key contributions each CRP aims to make to specific IDOs at system level, and an associated value proposition.

This section outlines how these two sets of priorities can be developed.

If innovation pathways to impact are to be successful, then there must be an alignment with specific national commitments (poverty reduction plans, CAADP country compacts, rural development plans, agricultural development frameworks etc.) and, where they exist, with agreed regional objectives. This does not mean these are the only criteria and in some cases the CGIAR's intended beneficiaries may differ from those that a Government may wish to focus support on for wider national purposes, but if so this should be made clear. Both the system and the CRP level prioritization processes will need to be designed so as to take the national commitments into account. At the international level this will need to engage GFAR and regional organizations. Consultation on revision of the IDOs should be the ideal process by which to engage and work through the Regional Forum mechanism, as is being done already with the CGIAR-CAADP linkage and FARA, to align, for example, the CAADP national investment plans with the CRP IDOs in the same locations.

#### a. System Level IDOs

Development of the system level IDOs will require a number of strategic studies and analyses, commissioned and/or implemented by the Consortium and ISPC in close collaboration, and linked to a consultative process with a wider group of CGIAR stakeholders. The Consortium has invited ISPC, and ISPC has agreed, to work closely together in the development of these system level IDOs. ISPC will provide a number of specific inputs to the process, even though the Consortium will remain in charge of, and accountable for, the overall process and results. The Consortium will develop a set of Terms of Reference for professional inputs (strategic analysis,

---

<sup>3</sup> David Hoisington, Robert Nasi, Steve Staal and David Watson from the science leaders plus Jacqui Ashby, Frank Rijsberman, Anne-Marie Izac and Andrew Ward from the Consortium Office.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

studies, modelling efforts) to be commissioned or implemented in-house, with due attention to the inclusion of gender expertise and consideration of gender outcomes where ever relevant. The Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP), a global partnership originally instituted from a request by the CGIAR gender specialists, is an additional resource able to support the consideration of gender in the implementation of the SRF Action Plan. In addition to ISPC, it is expected that IFPRI and/or CRP2 could play a role in the assessment and analysis of possible IDOs – as a consultant with a specific ToR - and help assess their relation with impact in the four domains of the SLOs.

In addition to the development of system IDOs as proposed by ISPC in their White Paper, the Consortium proposes that it will also be helpful to express the CGIAR's ambition level for each of the four dimensions of the system level objectives, food insecurity, rural poverty, malnutrition and ecosystem services, through MDG-like overall impact targets. These targets would indicate the degree to which the CGIAR Consortium members and CGIAR investors aim to contribute to the resolution to these global challenges. Ambition levels for the four system-level objectives will include gender-specific targets that are valid in terms of gender equity goals critical to impact and linked to internationally accepted development goals for closing the gender gap in agriculture. Consideration will be given to the adequacy of sex-disaggregated data for expressing gender equality and to the need for other indicators and metrics that capture dimensions of gender equality not measurable with sex-disaggregated data.

Depending on the process of development and adoption of Sustainable Development Goals by the international community, these may (or may not) provide sufficient guidance for the CGIAR. The intent would be to link the work of the CGIAR to international accepted development goals, such as those pursued by, and accepted as key guidance by, the investors in the CGIAR. The relevance for the system level IDOs and subsequently the CRP IDOs is that if the ambition level of the CGIAR investors is to use the CRP portfolio as a key instrument to reduce the number of food insecure people in the world by 500 million over the next 15 years, for example, then we can scope and scale the investments and ambition level, impacts and outcomes required to meet these targets.

### **b. CRP Level IDOs**

In response to their own additional analysis, comments from stakeholders, and the first or interim set of System Level IDOs that we would expect to have in late 2012 / early 2013, the CRPs are then expected to develop a revised set of IDOs early in 2013. These proposed outcomes will be analyzed by the Consortium, ISPC and external reviewers/advisers. The revised IDOs will be put up for discussion in a set of workshops to be organized by the Consortium where the CRPs discuss, refine and negotiate these outcomes with the Consortium and their investors and key external partners. If ISPC, external reviewers or investors find that CRPs are low-balling the ambition level, for example, or have different regional priorities than stakeholders and investors, these could be negotiated during these workshops – not unlike the

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

negotiations that take place during the development of bilateral projects, but at the larger, portfolio level.

The proposed process of developing and negotiating harmonized IDOs for the CRPs iteratively in the first half of 2013 through a series of workshops is a key building block to increase the consistency and coherence of the CRP Portfolio; and key for the SRF Update and for the development of a Performance Management System as well. The process has not yet been carefully designed, and is only outlined here. The meeting of CGIAR science leaders on September 13-14 in Montpellier will be a key input into this process – as will be consultation with investors and external partners and stakeholders such as GCARD or CADP on the manner in which they can be involved appropriately.

While each of the CRPs will propose the IDOs relevant to their program, it is expected that they will be guided by the system level prioritization exercise in terms of the nature or type of indicators chosen to express IDOs. CRPs are expected to have comparable outcomes, at least across comparable groups of CRPs, or CRPs aiming to contribute to the same system level IDO. In other words, while each of the CRPs remains responsible for their own set of IDOs, the prioritization exercises are expected to result in a very significant harmonization of the indicators used to express outcomes, so that results become comparable across the portfolio to the extent feasible and reasonable. It is not expected that work on improved germplasm becomes comparable to that on natural resources management (NRM) or on policy – but within each of these areas it should be possible to achieve reasonable comparability.

A second element negotiated during the CRP Outcome workshops in the first and second quarter of 2013 will be the value propositions developed by the CRPs associated with each IDO. In other words, the cost to achieve each outcome will need to be stated and stated, enabling an analysis and assessment of value for money provided by each of the CRPs in their contribution to system level IDOs.

The CRP Outcome Workshops would ideally be organized in sets of 3-5 CRPs during one workshop, so that logically related CRPs would be discussed together, providing an opportunity to compare and contrast, look at overlap and synergies, and potentially reach agreement on more consistent, focused IDOs not just within but across CRPs.

The CRPs would be given an opportunity to revise their final proposed sets of IDOs and associated value propositions before submitting them to the Consortium for approval, and for subsequent (or parallel) review by ISPC. The target would be to have revised sets of IDOs for the full CRP portfolio, in order to use these for resource allocation in the 2014 Financing Plan – see the section on the Performance Management System.

This proposal describes in brief outline a very complex process – and is therefore by necessity overly simplistic. In practice this process will not be a straightforward selection of the “correct set of outcomes” – but rather a negotiated process of what is feasible and realistic with the budgets available and based on the knowledge we have now and the partnerships we have

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

built to date. While it is realized that the above is a challenging time table – driven by the desire to affect the 2014 Financing Plan and annual cycle – it is also clear that the development of the system and CRP level IDOs will have to be an iterative process rather than a one-off exercise. Establishing the IDO's will be difficult initially as many of the stakeholders are inexperienced in the negotiations and trade-offs that will be required and it is likely that many gaps in data and knowledge will be discovered. The quality, focus, reliability or accuracy, and the consistency of the IDOs across the CRP portfolio will therefore have to improve over time with several cycles of iterative improvement.

Specifically, while the CRP level IDOs are expected to be influenced by the system level IDOs, as well as IDOs from other CRPs, and thus become more comparable and consistent across the CRP portfolio than they were through the development of the first set of CRP proposals, it is recognized that this will take time.

The development of System and CRP level IDOs will take care to include careful consideration of the cross-cutting issues identified as critical to achieving development impact, i.e. gender research, in-situ agro-biodiversity conservation and capacity strengthening. The approach to each of these issues is further described in the section on Cyclical Updating of the SRF.

The Gender and Agriculture Research Network has identified and will propose for consideration a small set of cross-cutting IDOs identified as critical to achieving development impact in relation to gender equity. These refer to outcomes of broad relevance to the CRPs that cannot accurately be expressed or measured in terms of sex-disaggregated data. Gender-specific IDOs should be discussed in the Science Leader meeting on September 13-14 as part of the effort at harmonization across the CRP portfolio. Subsequently, gender-specific IDOs and the related value proposition should be discussed in the set of workshops to be organized by the Consortium for refining and negotiating outcomes.

Feedback on an early draft of the Action Plan shows that some of the concerns can be summarized as follows:

1. Researchers can only be held accountable for research outputs and cannot be held accountable for achieving outcomes.
2. While IDOs are the right thing to aim for, it is not easy to define them for several reasons:
  - a. Hard to define quantitative outcomes for NRM and policy research;
  - b. Research is a risky business, hard or impossible to predict outcomes accurately; and
  - c. Achieving outcomes takes longer than the 3-year CRP commitments.

While it is acknowledged that it is difficult to have confidence that such a complex process is feasible before it has been realized (what could be called “fear of the unknown”), some reassurance can be derived from the fact that other fields and other organizations in research for development have gone through similar processes, and demonstrated their feasibility. There is an active community of development researchers, for example, engaged in “outcome

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

mapping”<sup>4</sup> (an approach originally developed by IDRC), and a range of methods to deal with the concerns described above, some of which were applied in the CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food, for example.

It is necessary but not sufficient for research to generate high quality research outputs. While it is clear that impacts can rarely be attributed to research alone, as many other actions and actors contribute to achieving impact, the art of designing meaningful IDOs is to find the middle ground between outcomes that are a reasonable proxy for impact and outcomes that researchers can be held accountable or responsible for. While researchers cannot achieve IDOs alone, they can be held accountable for developing partnerships that do achieve outcomes, and they can be jointly responsible for achieving outcomes with their partners.

Specifically, the design outlined above does take many of the concerns into account, as follows:

1. Prioritization does not target a single overall “optimization”, but by SLO, separating 4 key dimensions, i.e. not directly comparing productivity with NRM.
2. There is recognition that prioritization is not a modelled, analytical solution, but a political and managerial process with a negotiated outcome.
3. The prioritization and resource allocation is not a one-shot answer but a cyclical, iterative, learning process.
4. There will be a portfolio investment approach to performance management, not maximizing short term benefits but a long term stream of benefits, taking into account risk levels.

### 4. Performance Management

Following prioritization of system level IDOs, the Consortium will propose an overall indicative Resource Allocation across groups of system level IDOs by region, based on analysis of potential impact, as well as overall CGIAR competencies and unique potential for value addition. The Consortium will request advice from ISPC as well as commission studies from IFPRI and others to aid in its analysis and will also engage in a process of strategic consultation with investors and stakeholders, including the Gender and Agriculture Network. This Resource Allocation proposition will strategically balance the four main domains in which the CGIAR is active through a political-managerial process – in essence developing the investment strategy of the CGIAR (not unlike the process any major investor or donor goes through to a greater or lesser extent periodically) - that will be based on:

- analysis to optimize socio-economic benefits (impacts) and their more equitable distribution to poor rural women of the overall investment portfolio likely to be available to the CGIAR.
- scientific/innovation portfolio analysis that balances the relatively lower risks associated with short-term impacts gained through delivery of known technology at scale, with high risks through blue sky research that potentially can deliver breakthrough solutions over time; and

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/>



## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

- political and managerial considerations that moderate the theoretically optimal analysis to within a realistically feasible set, taking into account the demands of stakeholders, the priorities of partners, the constraints on funding and/or implementation capacity of the CGIAR system.

This indicative Resource Allocation could be seen as the shopping list of the system – the desirable investment in system level IDOs, in other words the system’s demand for IDOs, independent of the actual CRP level IDOs that are on offer.

The system level indicative Resource Allocation will be proposed to the Fund Council as part of the 2014 Financing Plan, and will also be incorporated in the 2013 SRF Update.

An analysis of the proposed CRP IDOs and associated value propositions against the indicative Resource Allocation will enable the Consortium to negotiate the maximum impact for its overall investment budget from the available set of CRPs. It is expected that CRP Leaders, and through them the partners that implement the CRPs, would negotiate with the Consortium both the minimum, or satisfactory levels of investments and outcomes for which they will be held accountable, as well as, where appropriate the rewards associated with outperformance.

This negotiation forms the basis of the revised Performance Agreements that the Consortium will conclude with the CRPs – performance contracts that will specify specific outcomes and associated investment levels over time that the CRPs commit to deliver (as the current so-called Performance Agreements do not). Window-2 investments from CGIAR donors will be collected in a CRP specific sub-account and paid out based on the outcomes delivered by the CRP (with advances used to manage liquidity), based on an analysis of the overall investment in the CRP, i.e. taking into account the full budget (including bilateral funding).

A comparative analysis of the current and forecasted levels of overall investment in the CRPs (Window, 1, 2, 3 and bilateral) and the Resource Allocation based on optimization of the portfolio, taking into account the indicative Resource Allocation as well as the negotiated CRP level IDOs, will show how Window 1 funding can be allocated to:

- maximize or optimize value for money – invest where the best underinvested opportunities appear to be available;
- balance risk and protect the long term health of the portfolio – investing in areas that are critically underinvested in order to protect the long term ability of the system to generate impact; and
- achieve economies of scale, take advantage of system-wide investment opportunities, or prepare the portfolio for the future, based on advice through the foresight capacity.

In summary, following the development of system and CRP level prioritized sets of IDOs, the Consortium will:

1. develop an indicative Resource Allocation that will serve as a guideline for investments entrusted to its management across sets of system level IDOs.
2. negotiate Performance Agreements with CRPs that associate specific investments for contracted IDOs, and will hold the CRPs accountable for achieving these results (pay out

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

only when these outcomes are achieved), but also negotiate rewards associated with outperformance.

3. open sub-accounts for Window 2 investments in each CRP and pay out when IDOs are achieved as per the Performance Agreement.
4. annually propose Window 1 investments that maximize overall value for money, i.e. maximize impact, while taking into account the longer term stability of the system.

It is recognized that this is a fairly radical departure from the way the system has operated in the past, though it appears to the Consortium to be what the reform has mandated and what the basic instruments of Consortium, CRP portfolio and Fund have put in place to maximize impact against the SRF. As it may take the system a few years to adjust to this new priority setting and funding basis – a basis that emphasizes performance against agreed outcomes rather than institutional mandates, it is recognized that there may have to be some transitory measures to help the various components in the system get used to the new approach.

The following mechanisms are proposed to help manage the transition:

- Dedicated, temporary Performance Funds that operate for a few years until the new Performance Management System has fully taken over its functions. An example is the proposed Gender Performance Fund that will make additional resources available to selected CRPs that show high potential to deliver against specific gender research outcomes (as part and parcel of their regular CRP program of work and budget).
- Pilot-CRPs that volunteer to be in a first wave of 3-6 CRPs that will be first in going through the process of negotiating outcomes and signing revised Performance Agreements (for early adopters there could be awards such as signing bonuses or awards for outperformance – not available to CRPs that are not yet in the new financing system).

Again, the above brief outline is a short summary of a complex issue that does not do it justice and may seem overly simplistic. Many of the ideas mentioned briefly in this section do align well with recent thinking about aid effectiveness as developed by the Center for Global Development, for example.

The following two comments may help provide some context:

- Research is an inherently risky business – and the performance management system will need to recognize that. That is very well possible. Rather than mechanistically setting single level performance goals and rewarding their achievement, performance systems can recognize that achieving goals is uncertain and create incentives to maximize performance in an uncertain environment, creating the flexibility for the implementers to respond to risks and opportunities experienced.
- Care should be taken not to maximize short term benefits (shorter term adaptive activities, or for instance breeding pipeline activities where variety adoption is relatively easy to document) at the expense of long term benefits, i.e. particularly in research there needs to be investment in enough “blue sky” / high risk research to ensure that the pipeline of “low hanging fruit” remains filled. This is not different from portfolio or pipeline investment strategies in other areas, where different types of time horizons and

different types of investment opportunities are taken into account. It is clear that the CGIAR, and the Consortium specifically, will need to gain experience in developing and implementing such approaches. Clearly there needs to be a balance in accountability and rewards for short- versus long-term outcomes and impact.

Also, while the performance contracts should reflect the prioritization and value propositions of CRPs, they should be realistic regarding what CRPs can achieve. The monitoring and accountability system should encourage learning and collaboration; and the M&E costs be kept at reasonable level. The accountability and funding system should not by default favour certain areas of research. More emphasis can be put on good planning, innovative formation of new programs and partnerships that represent the reform, and learning through benchmarking and monitoring.

A risk matrix could be developed for the SRF taking into account the political and managerial considerations needed, the role of partners and stakeholders in the delivery of results, and the intrinsic differences between research areas (NRM, crops, systems).

## 5. Partnerships

One aspect of the reform of the CGIAR is that investors and outside partners are expecting it to help open up the CGIAR system, perceived by many on the outside as closed and insulated, and contribute to more effective partnerships. While it is clear that many on the inside of the CGIAR system do not share the perception that the CGIAR is closed, and in fact pride themselves on their excellent partnering skills, when our relationships with external partners is concerned their perception is our reality. Or in other words, what counts is not what we think of ourselves but what our partners think of us (a variation on “the customer is king” – a reality for all service providers). As our partners are getting impatient to see this aspect of the reform deliver results, and as the various elements of the reform to date are relatively silent on what constitutes good partnership, it is proposed here that the SRF Action plan puts in place the CGIAR’s goals and targets on the partnership front.

This will involve an internal discussion as well as a conversation with our partners on the key mutual expectations of good partnership, and how the CGIAR can deliver on these.

Part of this will no doubt relate to sharing resources, measured as the share of partners of CRP budgets. We know that current partner allocations of the Window 1+2 share of CRP budgets are on the order of 5%, while the partner share of overall budgets (including W3 and bilateral) appears to be more on the order of 30%. We should discuss what appropriate expectations of our partners are and how we can deliver against these. The CGIAR and its partners should not only agree on fair sharing of resources, but also on sharing of responsibility and accountability for results.

Funding is not the only measure of a partnership – a role in the development of proposals and ideas is another, and a role in the management of the implementation of the program is another. Some of the CRPs are working with ICRA (International Centre for development

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

oriented Research in Agriculture), KIT and ILAC to develop their partnerships into effective innovation platforms.

In short, it is proposed that as part of the SRF Action Plan process, the CGIAR Consortium develops, in collaboration with partners, a set of goals and targets of what makes for good partnerships, and then develop proposed actions to move our practice closer to these goals.

As part of this assessment the Consortium is preparing to commission a global CGIAR Partner Perception survey (to update the survey conducted in 2006 by GlobeScan) to have a baseline against which we can assess performance going forward. The survey is expected to include an ability to generate CRP-level partner perception reports. The partner perception survey will include consideration of unique types of partnership required for the gender transformative approaches that are integral to several CRP Gender Strategies.

There are some key partnership development processes ongoing. Worth mentioning is the CAADP-CGIAR mapping and alignment process, which will be reviewed at the Dublin 2 meeting, scheduled for 17-19 September (in Dublin, Ireland).

### 6. Cyclical Updating of the SRF

The period of implementation of this Action Plan, after approval by the 2012 Funders Forum, will be from mid November 2012 until mid 2013, so that key results can be incorporated in the 2014 Financing Plan. During this period of time, the current version of the SRF will be amended to implement the approved Action Plan and address any other issue that may emerge from the discussions, for example the need for inclusion of (or rewording of) a strategic result to refer explicitly to gender equality, expressed in several internationally recognized development goals and identified as critical for system-level impact by the Gender and Agriculture Research Network.

The Consortium will then prepare and submit the **2013 SRF Update** to the Found Council and/or Funders Forum (to be discussed in Punta Del Este at the 2012 Funders Forum). It is proposed to update the SRF cyclically, in essence keep it as a living document, and produce an updated version every 2 years.

#### a. Incorporating a Foresight Dimension into the SRF

With the lead time from initial research to outcome delivery research within the CRPs needs to be relevant for the future. We cannot, with certainty, predict the future but forward-looking anticipatory research for development will guide the content of future versions of the SRF and their implementation. To do this the Foresight Dimension needs to take into consideration possible future evolutions of key issues, both advances in scientific understanding and the nature of changes in the physical and human contexts.

Key elements of the Foresight Dimension for the SRF will be:

1. **Compatibility with the Performance Management System:** The Foresight Dimension needs to be able to contribute to the shaping of the Performance Management System

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

(PMS) but as foresight is an evolutionary rather than a static process it will also need to take into account evidence generated by the PMS.

2. **Utilisation of available resources:** For a balanced consideration of foresight the CGIAR will make use of the best available data (collected using different types of methodologies<sup>5</sup>), interpretations from different sources and integrating the views of diverse stakeholders. Resources directly available to the CGIAR are presented in Annex 2. In addition other teams have also worked to bring together knowledge from multiple sources, e.g. Pretty et al 2010<sup>6</sup>. Gaps where additional information is required will need to be considered.
3. **Disciplines to be considered in foresight:** A balance is required so that dynamics (social, economic and biological) within natural resource management, systems research and commodities are taken into account as well as advances in research and research uptake.
4. **Systems level input:** CGIAR research is an element of the system and system dynamics will affect the level of impact of the research. Therefore experts on agriculture and natural resource systems need to contribute to the Foresight Dimension.
5. **Dynamic:** So as not to become outdated input will be required on an ongoing/ regular basis into the Foresight Dimension both from the CRPs through the PMS and from the wider foresight community.<sup>7</sup>

**Trends in the gender gap in agriculture:** achieving the goal of reducing the number of food insecure people in the world by 500 million over the next 15 years depends critically on reducing inequalities between poor rural women and men in the benefits they obtain from agricultural innovation in the broadest sense (encompassing technologies, institutions and policies). The foresight dimension should include specific attention to anticipatory research, trends, risks and scenarios for change in relevant gender disparities.

### Foresight Focus and Input Requirements for the Zero Draft SRF

The Foresight Dimension needs to be manageable and the SLOs provide the logical structure for this. However, in addition the Foresight Dimension needs to consider if the SLOs will maintain their relevance in future scenarios and suggest alterations.

**Foresight Dimension and the SLOs:** The Foresight Dimension of the SRF should develop future scenarios based on what is required to maximise the contribution to the SLOs through their indicators (*Intermediate Development Outcomes*). Agreeing the Intermediate Development Outcomes is required before future scenarios can be finalised. However, the structure and approach for developing future scenarios can be developed in the meantime. Input, guidance and review is required for the zero draft of the SRF Action Plan on:

---

<sup>5</sup> As is presented in Lattre, de M. (2006). The use of foresight in setting agricultural research priorities. *Science and Technology Policy for Development, Dialogues at the Interface* Box, L. and Engelhard, R. (eds). Anthem Press London UK.

<sup>6</sup> J. Pretty et al, 2010, 'The 100 top questions of importance to the future of global agriculture'. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, pp 219-236, Vol 8, number 4.

<sup>7</sup> This will be a key task of the Global Foresight Hub.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

- i) **The Appropriate Available Resources/ Reference materials:** In Annex 2 the Consortium has identified key resources/ points of reference to be used in the development of the Foresight Dimension. This list needs to be reviewed and additional key resources provided.
- ii) **Balanced Consideration of Foresight Methodologies:** Different but equally valid foresight methodologies will lead to differences in possible future scenarios. The Foresight Dimension needs to consider how to develop the balance of plausible ways and futures that can inform decision making to support progress towards the SLOs. Discussions at GCARD<sup>8</sup> have been planned so as to provide concrete advice on this and Centers have provided case studies (Annex 2).
- iii) **Ensuring an appropriate transdisciplinary approach:** The disciplines agreed will provide the components which will develop the future scenarios for contributing to the SLOs. These should represent the natural and social sciences as well as experts of the systems within which the research is conducted and will be adopted (e.g. public and private sector, media, universities, policy etc). The CGIAR needs to have this discussion internally to provide a basis for the Zero Draft SRF Action Plan.
- iv) **Identifying the Types of Organisations Required in Consultations:** In addition to point iii) the types of organisations whose opinions need to be included or considered in the foresight analysis and its conclusions need to be identified.
- v) **Developing a framework for the Foresight Dimension:** An examination of recent trends/ ruptures in terms of a) the SLO indicators and an analysis of how much CGIAR has been influencing these trends and the reasons for this; b) in the impact of different fields of science and an analysis of the reasons for this; c) science and how they could contribute to the SLOs.
- vi) **Foresight review of the SLOs:** The Foresight Dimension also needs to consider the use of anticipatory research in the review and adaption the SLOs and the IDOs over time so that they retain their validity.
- vii) **Keeping the Foresight Dimension Current and Appropriate:** Foresight is an ongoing need for the CGIAR. The Foresight Dimension will need to evolve so that it remains relevant. An efficient mechanism for achieving this is required. This is another discussion that can commence straight away.
- viii) **Agreement on who should take the Foresight Dimension Forward:** The Foresight Dimension needs to develop a Core Working Group which will drive linkages so as to ensure diversity, creativity, collective action and dialogue is enshrouded in the *modus operandii* of the group. The Core Working Group will include GFH and CGIAR representatives. The Consortium will provide an arbitration role within the group. Once formed their first task will be to agree on their approach.

Foresight is a major focus of the GCARD. Foresight sessions have been planned by GFAR in consultation with the Consortium. GCARD will therefore be highly relevant to the planning of the Foresight Dimension and is likely to influence the Foresight Dimension of the SRF Action Plan.

---

<sup>8</sup> Discussed with the Foresight Team of the GCARD Organising Committee.

**Key Analyses to be Conducted Post Development of the Intermediate Development Outcomes**

<b>Process</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Initial Identification and Agreement of key resources	By members developing the Zero Draft Reviewed by consultations before and during GCARD.
Consideration of Foresight Methodologies	To be based on discussions at GCARD but written up and reviewed straight after GCARD.
Identification and Initial Selection of Key Disciplines	By members developing the Zero Draft Reviewed by consultations before and during GCARD.
Identification and Initial Selection of types of organisations required in Consultations.	By members developing the Zero Draft Reviewed by consultations before and during GCARD.
Foresight Review of the SLOs	By members developing the Zero Draft Reviewed by consultations before and during GCARD.
Keeping the Foresight Dimension Current and Appropriate	By members developing the Zero Draft Reviewed by consultations before and during GCARD.
Formation of a Foresight Dimension Core Working Group.	Discussions in the run up to and during GCARD will be used by the Consortium as a basis for establishing this group.
Identification of knowledge gaps and plans for addressing them developed	Foresight Dimension Core Working Group

**b. Cross-cutting issues**

A number of important issues have been declared cross-cutting issues for the CRP portfolio, meaning that the expectation is that all CRPs address and “mainstream” or integrate these issues to the extent this is practical and appropriate in their workplans and budgets. Cross-cutting issues are: (a) gender research; (b) in-situ conservation of agro-biodiversity; and (c) capacity strengthening.

Of these three cross-cutting issues, gender research is most advanced in its implementation of a mainstreaming approach. The CGIAR now has developed a comprehensive *Consortium Level Gender Strategy* (2012) that commits to deliver research outputs with measurable benefits to women farmers in target areas within four years of inception of any given Program and to ensure the deployment of best-in-class scientific talent for this purpose. Research on gender is now conceived in the CGIAR’s Strategic Results Framework as a theme that cross-cuts the CGIAR Research Programs because significant opportunities exist for cross-program synergy and efficiency. Consequently, in early 2012 a senior advisor for gender research was appointed at the Consortium office and a Gender and Agriculture Research Network established to support the development and implementation of a Gender Strategy by each Program. Clear and enforceable accountability mechanisms designed to improve the relevance of the CGIAR’s

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

research to poor women are integral to the Consortium's approach and include monitoring of each Program's Gender Strategy results, the resources it allocates to achieve these and its deployment of gender expertise.

By the end of 2012 about two-thirds of the CRPs are expected to have approved Gender Research Strategies in place, and attention will shift to their implementation. Key actions by the CRPs to support this process are:

- (1) Formulation of an annual Program-level gender workplan based on the Strategy that specifies the activities required for integration and mainstreaming, with well-defined responsibilities assigned at all relevant organizational levels
- (2) Addressing the need to front-load capacity via recruitment, training and partnerships with sources of gender expertise external to the CGIAR
- (3) Institutionalizing the practice of budgeting realistically for gender research as part of the normal plan of work and budget so that commitments to do gender research are actually met.
- (4) Collaboration of gender researchers across Programs so that duplication and fragmentation of effort among scarce human resources can be minimized while strategic opportunities for synergy are exploited.
- (5) Rigorous performance monitoring with incentives for meeting internationally recognized quality standards for social science research on gender and for institutionalizing the policy and practice required for mainstreaming.

Realistically, it will take most Programs a few years before these activities are properly internalized since budgets need to be adjusted and experience with carrying out proper research on this front is limited. The Consortium therefore proposes a graduated process of technical and financial support designed to embed the five actions outlined above into normal practice within Programs.

The mainstreaming of the other two cross-cutting issues is less advanced, but a similar approach is proposed to be followed. For in-situ Agro-Biodiversity Conservation a workshop will be held from 24-26 July that brings together CRPs with a number of outside experts to help formulate a Consortium approach to mainstreaming this issue in the CRP portfolio. Compared to Gender Research the capacity in the system to carry out the work associated with agro-biodiversity is well developed and the effort required is mostly a programming and budgeting effort.

For capacity strengthening the picture is more mixed and an effort more like that followed for Gender Research is likely to be necessary. To start with the Consortium will issue a first note towards a Consortium Capacity Strengthening Strategy later in July to kick off the process.

### **c. CGIAR Competencies and Comparative Advantage**

The CGIAR's boundaries in the global agricultural research capability require more attention in the SRF and in the Action Plan. The updated SRF needs for the CGIAR to clearly set out what it sees as its role and functions in the world, in the context of a rapidly changing architecture of AR4D, where it becomes important to maintain a clear and coherent institutional purpose to



## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

ensure best value from international actions. The SRF should ensure that the CGIAR is seen to have specific and identifiable roles relative to other actors, in particular given the changing status of national systems and the rise of alternative research providers.

Specifically, CGIAR emphasis should be on international public goods, and not on delivery and out-scaling. For global impact targets other actors are essential. That implies that as many of the IDOs are likely to require delivery and out-scaling, partnerships will be essential for the CGIAR's success. The core idea is that while CRPs will not include – or finance - the activities related to development and out-scaling, they will be held accountable for building the partnerships that will ensure that innovations developed by CRPs can be adopted and reach scale.

Both the system and CRP level prioritization should explicitly address the CGIAR's competencies as well as its boundaries, its comparative advantages and the roles of others.

### **d. Regional strategies**

While most CRPs have regional strategies inside their programs, there isn't yet a CRP portfolio-wide set of regional strategies. Part of the development of such strategies is expected to result from the system level prioritization exercise that will lead to system level IDOs that are region (and country) specific. Development of regional strategies will facilitate the engagement of regional partner and investors. It is proposed that once both system and CRP level IDOs are developed, an effort to synthesize regional strategies will be conducted, capitalizing on ongoing efforts such as the CAADP-CGIAR mapping and alignment project, and where necessary or relevant these strategies will be used for consultation with regional partners.

### **e. Analysis and monitoring capacity**

As the focus in CGIAR funding shifts to paying for performance – payments linked to delivering agreed outcomes – it is clear that the system will need a strengthened capacity to measure, monitor and analyse its actions and their consequences as these link to IDOs – out in the field. This can capitalize on a vastly increased capacity to measure and monitor at prices that are falling rapidly..

The Consortium and CRPs internal monitoring, analysis and auditing capacity needs to be synced up with: (a) the CGIAR's external evaluation capacity - to be developed through the Independent Evaluation Arrangement, for which a Director has been recently recruited; and (b) ISPCs SPIA, which is developing proposals for an improved capacity of the CGIAR to measure baselines for CRP IDOs, as well as for assessment of the relationship between IDOs and impacts.

In coming months the CRPs leaders and the Consortium are expected to develop further this section on the CRP internal analysis and monitoring capacity, while the Consortium will engage with the IEA and ISPC on the coordination of the internal audit (Consortium), external evaluation (IEA) and impact assessment (ISPC-SPIA) functions.

## **f. Research Support**

The March 2012 Fund Council meeting approved the CRP Research Support program – popularly known as the Genebanks CRP. This is a major cross-CRP and cross-center effort to invest about \$100M of Window 1 funding in the continued good health of a major CGIAR asset, its genebanks, which form a critical pre-cursor to the success of many of not all plant-based commodity CRPs. This is also a critical piece of collective action that is likely to lead to professionalization of genebank management generally and:

- form the basis for improved and accelerated sharing of best practices across the system,
- bring down the O&M costs across genebanks, and
- improved management of information to have more effective and efficient linkages between the diversity in the genebanks and the breeding programs, both inside and outside the CGIAR, through the new central and shared genebank information system GeneSys.

The development of the Genebank CRP proposal depended critically on a system wide genebank “costing study”, which helped provide a level playing field across genebanks and helped provide more accurate and comparable costs of the genebanks as separate and separable activities.

It is imaginable that the example of the successful development of the genebank proposal can be followed for other areas of “research support”, possibly as extensions of the scope of collaboration currently embedded in the Genebank CRP. Possible areas that could be linked are, for example, the Integrated Breeding Platform develop by the Generation Challenge Program, or the development of a system-wide shared Bio-informatics service group.

Other areas linked to improved collaboration or collective action related to shared standards, systems or services related to data and knowledge management will be explored in a workshop scheduled for September 11 and 12 in Montpellier.

## **7. Immediate steps to initiate development of the Action Plan**

This Action Plan is developed in 2012 and will hopefully be approved at the Funders Forum in Punta del Este in early November 2012. The Action Plan will then be implemented between November and mid-2013, resulting in an updated SRF, to be approved in the second half of 2013 and taken into account for the 2014 annual cycle.

There are two action items that are proposed to be initiated ahead of the approval of the Action Plan in Punta del Este:

1. Initiating the system level prioritization, starting early with this process so that the system level prioritization can provide guidance for the bottom up prioritization at CRP level; and

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

2. Documenting the best set of IDO's CRPs currently already have, without further work, because many CRPs have done work on prioritization and further specification of IDO's beyond the milestones and outcomes described in their proposals.

With respect to system level prioritization, the Consortium aims to have a process plan and set of ToRs for the development of the system level IDOs by September 30, so that these can be Annexed to the SRF Action Plan. Work on the development of the first generation of system level IDOs can then be prepared or even start in October 2012, and would be expected to be completed (with several interim products along the way) by mid-2013, in parallel with the development of the CRP level outcomes.

With respect to CRP level prioritization, the CRPs teams have in a number of cases already developed much better, and more strategic, outcomes than those contained in the proposals as approved by the Fund Council. Others are in the middle of an ISPC mandated priority setting process that will also help define much clearer outcomes. Still others have not yet expressed a small set of clear, strategic outcomes to help express and quantify their key contribution to the system level outcomes and will need to do some internal analysis and consultation (and most likely negotiation). It is proposed that CRP level prioritization, through small sets of clearly targeted and prioritized IDOs, will be initiated in September 2012 as follows.

All CRPs are requested to submit their current best estimates of their IDOs as they have them available now by September 10, in preparation of the Science Leader meeting on Montpellier on September. The first day of this meeting will primarily be devoted to discussion of CRP level IDOs across the portfolio: definitions, harmonization, regionalization, etc. CRPs then have until September 30 to update their current set, which will be shared with CGIAR stakeholders, and investors in Punta Del Este as an Annex to the SRF Action Plan.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

### Annex 1: Consultation on the SRF Action Plan

An extensive program of consultations is presented in Table 1. The aim of the consultations is to strengthen the SRF Action Plan in the light of the experiences and insights of others so as to facilitate the effective implementation of this Action Plan. A secondary benefit has been raising the profile of the focus of the CGIAR.

**Table 1. Consultation Plan for the SRF Action Plan**

Action	Who	Date
Internal zero draft (outline) produced	Consortium Office	By 30 <sup>th</sup> June
Input sought and incorporated to develop a complete draft.	CRPs, Centers, GFAR Secretariat	By 31 <sup>st</sup> August
Stakeholders invited to register to comment and consultation on the Full Draft	Funders Forum, Consortium Board, ISPC, CRPs, Centers, GFAR regional fora, invitation also posted on <a href="http://cgiar.org">cgiar.org</a>	22 <sup>nd</sup> August to 30 <sup>th</sup> September
E-Feedback, in which electronic comments are invited on an uploaded copy of the Full Draft	Above registered participants	3-9 <sup>th</sup> September
Significant areas of comment and main points being made during E-Feedback synthesised.	Consortium Office	9-12 <sup>th</sup> September
Synthesis shared with WG2 for consideration during the Science Leaders meeting	Consortium Office	12 <sup>th</sup> September
Based on the synthesis and WG2 discussion key areas for in-depth discussion (termed discussion points) identified and consultation questions developed	WG2	19 <sup>th</sup> September
E-Consult in which participants provide detailed comments on the discussion points through a facilitated electronic process	Registered participants from above	24-30 <sup>th</sup> September
E-Consult summarised and suggested changes to the SRF Action Plan shared with WG2	Consortium Office and Consultant	2 <sup>nd</sup> October
Revised Action Plan (draft 2) produced.	Submitted to the Funders Forum	5 <sup>th</sup> October
Revised version (draft 2) presented and discussed at GCARD	GCARD participants	29 <sup>th</sup> October – 1 <sup>st</sup> November
Revised version (draft 2) presented to the Funders Forum for approval with a list of agreed recommended (further) changes from GCARD discussions.	Funders Forum	2 <sup>nd</sup> November

### Update on Consultations

This version of the SRF Action Plan developed by the Consortium Office working with WG2 was shared with ISPC and GFAR.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

ISPC was supportive of the SRF Action Plan in the manner that it gives a focus to CRP agenda setting and advocates for a holistic approach to the consideration of foresight. Pertinent points were made on the issue of foresight which were incorporated into the text of this version of the SRF Action Plan. Some concerns were expressed about linking planning too tightly with accountability for outcomes, including the concern that there needs to be a balance in accountability and rewards for short- versus long-term outcomes and impact. This is an issue that was later raised during E-Consult but should be addressed through good CRP governance striving for long term as well as short term returns. The ISPC recommended that the monitoring and accountability systems should be realistic and encourage learning and collaboration. More emphasis should be placed on the CGIAR's comparative advantage. These points, as with others made by the ISPC, should be addressed in the implementation of the Action Plan.

The GFAR secretariat agreed with the general direction of the SRF Action Plan although it felt there were points that need to be considered. For example they feel that the CGIAR needs to clearly set out what it sees as its role and functions in the world, in the context of a rapidly changing architecture of AR4D. Their comments led to a greater consideration of how the CGIAR should align with specific national commitments (poverty reduction plans, CAADP country compacts, rural development plans, agricultural development frameworks etc.) and, where they exist, with agreed regional objectives as well as initiatives such as the Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP). It is felt that the foresight section reads well but doesn't capture the full value of the Global Foresight Hub and the CGIAR's valuable role within this bigger network - and the value it can derive from others.

At the August meeting of FORAGRO it was felt that there was a lack of knowledge, outside the centres, of what the process seeks to achieve and highlighted the lack of specific alignment of national systems and plans with the CRPs. EFARD will be discussing the SRF Action Plan in October as will APAARI.

**Electronic Consultations:** 272 people registered to take part in one or both of the electronic consultations on the SRF Action Plan that took place in September 2012. The majority of these 35% were from non CGIAR research organisations followed by 24% from organisations which provide research delivery and 23% from the CGIAR, 14% of those registered worked for funding organisations.

**E-Feedback:** 20 people provided annotated comments on a draft copy of the SRF Action Plan. A lot of the comments focussed at lower level issues – issues that would need to be discussed once the Action Plan framework is agreed.

**E-Consult:** 17 people provided responses by email to questions on issues that arose from E-Feedback. The questions focussed on the issue of cross cutting IDOs; how could they be developed and applied and what has been peoples' experiences of similar approaches? No fundamental problems were raised by the participants although neither was overwhelming support for the Action Plan expressed. Without a strong mandate all registered participants were asked to complete a short survey to find out why so few registered participants had responded. An unrepresentative 14 people responded to the survey and opinions were divided as to whether the right questions had been asked, whether or not they had fundamental issues with the SRF Action Plan.

Therefore the points that have been raised in these consultations would be better considered during the implementation of the SRF Action Plan rather than in its revisions. The content of both consultations will therefore be made available to those implementing it.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

For both consultations and the survey a certain degree of misunderstanding was shown and one of the agreed conclusions of E-Consult was that the document could be presented in a format more accessible to a wider range of stakeholders. This will not be addressed in this version of the Action Plan but the Consortium is considering developing a separate overview of the Action Plan to provide clarity to those who are less up to date with the CGIAR. This would also be an opportunity to clarify the CGIAR's niche and comparative advantage.

As there will not be time to incorporate recommendations from the GCARD discussion into the Action Plan before the Funders Forum these will be presented as well as the Action Plan to the Funders Forum. If approved they will be incorporated into the final version of the Action Plan in November 2012.

## Annex 2: The Main Foresight Resources Available to the CGIAR

Through placing responsibility for foresight in the Consortium the independence of studies and the ability to direct and commission syntheses for its own use and ensure a sufficiently broad scope are maintained. However, to assist it to perform this function the Consortium will need to consider working with the following initiatives:

### 1. The Global Foresight Hub

GFAR has established a Global Foresight Hub, a facilitating mechanism with a commitment to assisting the CGIAR. It comprises three interconnecting elements:

- i) The **Forward Thinking Platform** is a web-based platform that offers an open space for exchanging and debating the futures of agriculture and rural development and the implications for agricultural research. In preparation for the GCARD the FTP has sought, collated and assessed studies so as to develop an inventory of key (recent) agricultural and environmental forward looking anticipatory studies.
- ii) **Global Foresight Academy** will develop the skills and capabilities of young professionals and support foresight activities on high-priority issues across GFAR constituencies. In this manner GFAR will contribute to collective capacity building, region by region, starting with Sub-Saharan Africa.
- iii) **Policy Dialogue Platform: Connecting Science and Society**, to facilitate dialogue between scientists, policy-makers and civil society, letting the voices of society, especially small farmers, be incorporated in shaping research orientations. GFAR will facilitate regular “Policy Dialogue Platforms” at international, regional and national levels. The results of the Forward Thinking Platform will be debated by representatives of civil society and policy-makers who will be informed about the implications of their choices.

The global foresight hub proposed and nurtured by GFAR has the potential to be a community of practice amongst a number of institutes and programs conducting an array of foresight studies. It would be an important source of information to turn to for scenario-building and for cross checking amongst stakeholder perspectives. It provides the opportunity for NARS to access global data and best practice methods for their own use. The CGIAR can be party to such a group and share information but there is no a priori reason why (as with other communities of practice) it would provide financial support to the organization of the hub or activities of other players per se.

### 2. The Independent Science and Partnerships Council (ISPC)

The ISPC’s responsibility in foresight is to contribute to the best available perspectives and data being incorporated into CGIAR priority setting, and to help distil a research agenda from the possible entry points for agricultural research for development. With regards its support to foresight within the SRF this would involve study and review and the maintenance of an independent and multidisciplinary stance to subject matter rather than modeling. It can help assure the Fund Council that the methods, approaches and individual components contributing to foresight (trends and future scenarios) used by the CGIAR are subject to quality control and/or tested against alternative perspectives.

## CGIAR SRF ACTION PLAN, OCTOBER 2012

In 2012 the ISPC will conduct studies on i) farm size dynamics and ii) urbanisation and food demand to guide CGIAR future priorities over the next 20 years. The studies will use a global perspective, seeking to define emerging trends and model systems. Concept notes including a summary of key findings of a literature review will be finalised by 22<sup>nd</sup> June. The full studies will be initiated on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2012 and a first draft of integrated annotated outline 1<sup>st</sup> August for review by ISPC; and first draft of SR papers by 10 September. The second draft SR submitted 15 January, will be sent to the Consortium Board on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013.

The ISPC could be called on to evaluate foresight studies commissioned by funders and, for instance, to provide balancing studies if methods or sector analyses predominate which cannot deal adequately with areas of activity (e.g. forestry) included in the CGIAR portfolio. It can advise the FC and Consortium where long term data might be required that would be developed by Consortium-commissioned work, perhaps with other agencies.

### 3. CRP2/ Global Futures for Agriculture project (<http://globalfuturesproject.com/>)

CRP2 will subsume and build on the experiences of the **Global Futures for Agriculture project** (<http://globalfuturesproject.com/>). The CRP will develop a central unit of disciplinary experts on foresight and multi-disciplinary teams which focus on the mandate crops and systems of the CGIAR as well as addressing the need to boost capacity in foresight studies. The project focuses on evaluating promising technologies, investments, and policy reforms. It has enhanced IFPRI's International Model for Policy Analysis of Agricultural Commodities and Trade (IMPACT), a model that projects the future production, consumption, and trade of key agricultural commodities, and can assess the effects of climate change, water availability and other major trends. CRP2 is in discussion with GFAR and the Consortium Office as to how to effectively link with its GFH and GCARD II.

**ASTI** (Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators), managed by IFPRI. The Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators (ASTI) initiative compiles, analyzes, and publicizes data on institutional developments, investments, and capacity in agricultural R&D (<http://www.asti.cgiar.org/>).

**CSI** (Consortium for Spatial information) (<http://www.cgiar-csi.org/>) links all the CGIAR's GIS/RS laboratories, and the many geospatial scientists and researchers within the CGIAR system, with scientists and institutions from around the world. CSI have already developed important collections of data on population, poverty, climate, soils, crops, livestock, transportation, and biodiversity and other geospatial Global Public Goods.

### Other CRPs

During the development of the inventory it has been identified that there are both foresight activities and foresight experience within other CRPs, particularly the CRPs on Water, Land and Ecosystems and Climate Change and Food Security. Other CRPs have also been involved in foresight studies, particularly using the IFPRI IMPACT model. The CRPs, particularly their M&E should contribute to the development of the Foresight Dimension.