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1. GENERAL INFORMATION

**Note to reader:** Issuing of the 2nd call for proposals is dependent on:

1. Fund Council approval of CGIAR’s 2016 – 2030 Strategy and Results Framework at its 13th meeting over 28-29 April 2015;
2. Centers and Consortium agreement on a coherent portfolio of 8-10 new generation CRPs in their meeting of 11 – 13 May 2015; and
3. The Consortium Board issue a targeted 2nd Call for CRP proposals in early June 2015.

This Guidance document (Guidance) is a companion to CGIAR’s 2016 – 2030 Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)\(^1\) and comprises the framework for the 2nd Call for CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs, and CRP 2nd Call)\(^2\)This Guidance is subsidiary to the SRF, so that in case of differences, the SRF prevails. The CRP 2nd Call is a response to the SRF and the new generation CRP proposals are expected to take the SRF as their first guidance, complemented by the operational guidelines provided in this Guidance.

Presuming the SRF will be approved, the FC requests the Consortium to initiate the CRP 2nd Call, and the Centers and Consortium agree on a coherent portfolio of 8-10 new generation CRPs in their meeting of 11 – 13 May 2015, the Consortium Board is expected to issue a targeted 2nd Call for CRP proposals in early June.

The proposal development process is in two stages:

1. Pre-proposals submitted in 2015 (refer table 1 below) that include a description of up to 5-7 Flagship Projects (FPs)\(^2\). Following external peer review the program and FP proposals will be rated in 4 categories:
   a. Satisfactory: will be invited to submit a full proposal;
   b. Satisfactory but with comments to be taken into account in the full proposal;
   c. Major concerns – full proposal will only be approved if these are addressed to satisfaction; and
   d. Unsatisfactory – full proposal will not be invited for this program or for this FP.

2. Full proposals will be invited in 2016. Full proposals will also be subject to further external peer review, although with the intention and likelihood of receiving financial support.

This Guidance document focuses on the pre-proposals. It aims to make clear what is expected in the pre-proposals – compared to what will be required in the full proposals. In some cases a short indication of what will be provided in the full proposal is expected in the pre-proposal. For example,

---

\(^1\) Approved by the CGIAR Consortium Board on 12 April 2015 (CB19/EDP-01).

\(^2\) FPs may be defined thematically or geographically to articulate the scientific/system issues they are addressing, identifying routes towards the IDOs and the IPGs that will result from this investment.
‘Site Integration Plans’ will be submitted with the full proposals in 2016, while the pre-proposals are expected to indicate in which countries the CRP expects outcomes at scale – and thus will participate in Site Integration Plans. Likewise, the pre-proposals will indicate what consultation has taken place at the pre-proposal stage, and specify what further consultation - and engagement with GCARD3 - is expected during the full proposal stage.

**Pre-proposals will be submitted through an online submission tool.**

Table 1: Timeline for issuing CRP 2nd Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present - June 2015</th>
<th>Designing an SRF-responsive and internally coherent CRP II portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week of 13 April</td>
<td>2nd virtual call of the group convened by ISPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd week April</td>
<td>Draft outputs of the working groups on ‘top-down analysis’ and ‘level-playing field’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April</td>
<td>“Bern-style” meeting on sidelines of Fund Council (FC) meeting in Bogor facilitated by ISPC to provide feedback from donors and others on the CRP portfolio design options and content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29 April</td>
<td>FC meeting considers CRP 2nd Call and issues strategic Guidance to the Consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13 May</td>
<td>3-day meeting of Centers (and CRP representatives) to agree on the composition of the CRP portfolio and lead centers for the expected 8-10 CRP’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June - Dec 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early June</th>
<th>Targeted call: Consortium Board (CB) invites Centers to submit pre-proposals (2 months) for the agreed portfolio of 8-10 CRPs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-August</td>
<td>CRP pre-proposals submitted. Review period starts by relevant entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 14 September</td>
<td>ISPC meeting to finalize their review and subsequent submission to the FC by end September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 28 – Oct 8</td>
<td>Period for feedback from Centers on the review comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8 - 9</td>
<td>Propose a pre-CB/FC meeting of Centers with ISPC and CB representatives to consider implications of the review comments on the portfolio design as a whole and identify any revisions that could be tabled to FC and also consider transitional arrangements for any elements to be dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>CB/FC meeting(s) provides feedback on the pre-proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: During this time period there will be a number of activities as part of GCARD3- a few pilot national consultations, regional consultations and a global event- which will provide valuable engagement with stakeholders and partners for the further development of the portfolio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan - Nov 2016</th>
<th>Full proposal stage and review – as earlier proposed in Guidance Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 January</td>
<td>CB invites full proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January- March</td>
<td>CRPs carry out National Consultations towards alignment with National priorities and activities and for finalization of Site Integration Plans (as part of GCARD3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Centers submit CRP proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May to September</td>
<td>Review of CRP proposals by relevant entities and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid November</td>
<td>CB/FC approval of CRPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Jan 2017</th>
<th>CRP II implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starts 1 January 2017</td>
<td>A ten year research portfolio with contracts for the first 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **PRE-PROPOSALS: KEY ELEMENTS TO BE ADDRESSED**

Pre-proposals should focus on tractable research questions; identify and describe the scientific and strategic rationale, key, gender and partnership strategy for maximizing impact, and overall theory of change and impact pathway for the program as a whole; and lay out embedded concept notes for a number of FPs through which the program aims to contribute to development outcomes in specific geographies or thematic areas. The summary of the CRP’s results will be provided in the CRP’s proposed ‘Performance Indicator Matrix’\(^3\). The results proposed by each CRP are expected to demonstrate contributions towards the delivery of CGIAR’s Results Framework generally, and aspirational CGIAR development targets for 2030 specifically, either directly, or through milestones that demonstrate progress towards these targets. Both the Results Framework and development targets are specified in the SRF.

Pre-proposals will include high-level estimates of the budget associated with the achievement of each result or outcome specified in the Performance Indicator Matrix. The budget will also include General and Administrative Expenses, at the total CRP level. The budgets will allow preliminary assessment of value for money and added value of the proposed research; that is, will the proposed research, at the cost indicated, deliver a fair share of the CGIAR targets as specified in the SRF? The indicative budget template for pre-proposals is contained in Annex 3.

Pre-proposals will specify the proposed leader for each FP, the principal investigator team of the CRP, and provide brief summaries of their qualifications in Annexes.

The full proposal will set out the research plans in sufficient detail to assess the scientific quality, originality, excellence and relevance of the proposed research program; the track record of the proposed teams, the strength of the partnerships and partner strategy for maximizing impact, and the potential impact and ‘reach’ of the proposed outcomes; and the appropriateness of the proposed detailed budget in relation to the scale of the challenge being addressed and the potential promise of the research.

2.1 **Flagship projects and clusters of activities**

Each CRP pre-proposal will specify how it is broken down into structured [Flagship Projects](#) (FP). Each FP will have specific objectives and may produce several outputs and research outcomes to achieve 2-3 of the CGIAR Development Targets specified in the SRF.

For internal CRP management purposes, each FP will be further made up of clearly articulated [Clusters of Activities (CAs)](#) which are sub-projects (in general 5 to 8). Each CA should result in products, services or attributes linked to the objectives, or research outputs. The CA plan **does not need to be submitted at the pre-proposal stage**.

---

\(^3\) The indicative Performance Indicator Matrix is set out at Annex 2.
2.2 Site integration plans

Pre-proposals should indicate the focus countries for which the CRP intends to work together with other CRPs on the preparation of site integration plans, including carrying out necessary consultations with national partners and stakeholders. Focus countries are those in which a CRP expects to achieve research outcomes at scale.

Full proposals should include CRP Site Integration Plans to show how CRPs will work together in a given country and in alignment with national priorities and activities. CRP leaders will develop sample Site Integration Plans at their meeting in June 2015, ground-truthing - which will be provided by national consultations (GCARD3) to enable alignment with national priorities and activities. These plans will involve multiple CRPs working towards the same outcome with shared staff, measurements, equipment, facilities etc. whenever possible, giving CRPs more flexibility in allocating resources. Site integration plans will identify high priority or focus sites where multiple CRPs are active and that jointly:

- Represent a reasonable selection of agro-eco and farming systems, and target populations
- Are reasonably aligned with CAADP and similar national government development priorities
- Represent a common problem with solution elements delivered by multiple CRPs
- Offer an opportunity to go to scale

The national consultations in the framework of GCARD3 will be piloted during the pre-proposal stage in 3-5 countries and during the full proposal stage during the remaining countries.

2.3 Partnership Strategy

CRP pre-proposals will indicate who the key strategic partners are and what their role is in the CRP.

CRP full proposals should include a partnership strategy that includes the following elements:

1. **Partnerships at the discovery, proof of concept and pilot level (if relevant) and scaling-up phase.**
   a. **Partnership at the discovery research level:** This can range from joint calls for proposals with agencies such as NSF, USDA/NIFA, BBSRC and EC’s DG Research, or research programs with researchers from national research agencies and universities, to joint research with NARS, ARIs, private sector and other appropriate research entities in focus countries.
   b. **Partnership at the proof of concept and pilot level:** Include local or regional organizations such as AGRA, local universities, private sector and other NGOs.
   c. **Partnership for scaling-up:** Engage local business communities, policy makers, and farmers’ organizations in the planning to ensure that technology and knowledge transfer is self-sustaining.

2. **Engagement and dialogue with stakeholders (starting with the GCARD3 process).** The pre-proposal should document whether and what (national) consultations have taken place; how the
results have been incorporated in the proposal and what additional consultations are planned during the Full proposal stage. The pre-proposal will indicate how the CRP has, interacted, or will engage during the full proposal development, with the GCARD3 consultation process.

3. **Alignment with regional initiatives [such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP)].** For Africa, for example, evidence should be provided at full proposal stage that CRP activities: (i) enhance the capacity of mandated African institutions in articulating and advancing an Africa Science and Technology agenda for agriculture; and (ii) strengthen synergies between CGIAR planning processes for its Africa-oriented initiatives and CAADP-based priorities in research, policy analysis, training and effective knowledge management and sharing. For other regions CRPs are expected to engage with regional and national organizations in a similar manner to the extent possible.

4. **Engagement with the private sector.** CRP theories of change should explicitly acknowledge the role of the private sector in CGIAR’s mission, with avenues for their involvement (e.g., multi-stakeholder platforms and alliances) made explicit.

5. **Development of partnerships based on key factors that can contribute to their success.** These include: a common agenda, shared measurement (e.g., data collection and analysis), activities coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action, consistent and open communication lines, and backbone and coordination support.

6. **Identify and demonstrate the role of partners in research and management / governance.** A typology of partners should be developed, indicating how partners provide leadership on components, and specifying partner membership of steering or management committees.

7. **Appropriate resourcing of partnerships.** CRP full proposals should indicate how partners and partnerships will be resourced. This may be through the allocation of a credible percentage (e.g. 20-30%) of total project funding to the different partnerships, justifying (i) those that are self-funded, (ii) those co-funded between the CRP and the partners, and (iii) those entirely funded by the CRP.

### 2.4 Gender Strategy

Ensuring gender-responsive outcomes is an integral component of a CRP’s strategy for maximizing impact. In addition to a section on the gender strategy for integrating gender equality into the CRP’s research and development activities, other elements to address gender explicitly include those on impact pathways, outcomes and theory of change; FPs, work plans, M&E, and reporting (see table 2 below for an exemplar of outcomes with a gender dimension).

CRP pre-proposals should present an outline of the CRP Gender Strategy and address gender issues in its theory of change, impact pathways and research outcomes at CRP and FP level.

All CRP full proposals should include an annex (approx. 4 pages) with 2 pages summarizing the gender analysis that was done before research priorities and questions were set, and how that informed the
priority setting. The other 2 pages should summarize how gender will be operationalized in the research agenda, and how progress will be tracked and ultimately evaluated.

This analysis should enable external reviewers to assess whether the outputs and outcomes and IDOs in the full proposal reflect an effective mainstreaming of gender research. This implies that a healthy and balanced pipeline will include consideration of gender across the research cycle, i.e. in defining and prioritizing target beneficiary populations and agro-socio-ecosystems; in setting objectives for discovery research; in the design and pilot testing of innovations and in going to scale with innovations demonstrated to benefit women as well as men at the pilot scale.

Table 2. Examples of outputs and outcomes that have an explicit gender dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio IDO</th>
<th>CRP IDO</th>
<th>CRP outcome</th>
<th>CRP output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved productivity in pro-poor food systems</td>
<td>Improved productivity of women’s livestock</td>
<td>Women adopt improved technologies</td>
<td>Pro-poor technical and institutional innovations increase productivity of women’s livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased control by women and other marginalized groups of assets, inputs, decision-making and benefits</td>
<td>Women are better empowered and gender equality in decision making and control over [forest, tree and agroforestry]resource use, management and benefits is improved</td>
<td>Decision makers at the local, national and international levels adopt effective portfolios of strategies and gender-sensitive guidelines for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of priority tree species to meet the needs of men and women stakeholders.</td>
<td>Methods and approaches for incorporating and/or recognizing local-level institutions (including rights and access) that are sensitive to gender-differentiated needs and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased and more equitable income from agricultural and natural resource management and environmental services earned by low roots, tubers and bananas</td>
<td>Increased and more equitable income earned by low income value chain actors, with an increased share captured by women.</td>
<td>Research aligned with farmers’ and end-users’ priorities: breeders incorporate gendered information on end-users needs and preferences into decision-making and</td>
<td>High-yielding hybrids with multiple resistance and desirable agronomic traits developed and deployed (2015) Initial evaluation trial planted, at least 5 hybrids selected based on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Guide for Developing CRP Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs); CRP 2013 POWBs; CRP Gender Strategy

2.5 Capacity Development Strategy

Capacity development should seek to enhance innovation throughout the agri-food system, including farmers and other groups along the value chain. To achieve this each CRP will use the CGIAR CapDev Framework for outlining and planning its capacity development activities. CRPs will demonstrate which of the nine elements of the CapDev Framework it will implementing and how.

CRPs should allocate sufficient resources to achieve the implementation of the key elements it will work on. Capacity development activities may be combined with relevant partnership programs to better equip local and regional institutions for research, development, manufacturing, marketing
and delivery of food and agriculture related products. Budgets allocated for capacity development should be a credible share of the total project budget.

2.6 Intellectual Asset Management, Open Access/Open Data

CRP pre-proposals are not required to specify their intellectual asset and open access management, but should plan to be compliant, as these strategies will be required at full proposal stage.

Each CRP full proposal will outline its intellectual asset management, as well as open access and data management strategies, in line with the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets (IA Principles) and the CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy (OA Policy).

Proposals must specify that for each collaboration and FP, research activities will be aligned with the CGIAR IA Principles and the OA Policy, taking into account requirements concerning farmers’ rights, genetic resources for food and agriculture, the sound management of intellectual assets and IPRs, the prompt and broad dissemination of research results subject to permitted restrictions to global accessibility, and fees.

An effective plan for the management and dissemination of intellectual assets comprising the inputs and outputs of the CRP will be an integral component of the proposal. Core elements concerning the CRP’s intellectual asset management and dissemination strategy, including in regards to open access and open data, which proposals are required to address, include:

- Sound management of intellectual assets and research outputs, ensuring interoperability via robust and commonly used standards and metadata schemas
- Dissemination of outputs to maximize global accessibility and impact
- Management of genetic resources for food and agriculture
- Safeguarding farmers’ rights
- Indicators and milestones

2.7 Governance and Management

CRP pre-proposals will be required to confirm that CRP governance and management will conform to this Guidance, that is, in essence along the lines agreed in the Consortium Response to the IEA Review of CRP Governance and Management. Pre-proposals will outline the proposed CRP governance and management arrangements.

CRP full proposals should identify an Independent Steering Committee, a CRP Leader and a CRP Management Committee as described in this Section. Figure 1 (below) illustrates the overall reporting structure that each CRP should implement.

Details on the responsibilities and composition of the entities and individuals involved in CRP governance and management are provided in Annex 4.
To note: Level Playing field: A critical issue in discussion among the Centers is the perceived and real difference between Lead and Participating Centers, as well as between CGIAR Centers and other partners, during the first round of CRPs. The intent for the CRP 2nd Call is to create a “level playing field” where all strategic partners have access to a fair share of the work and budget based on their ability to deliver outcomes cost-effectively. A Center working group is devising rules to operationalize this level playing field, which will be incorporated into this Guidance. One likely change is to rename “Lead Center” into “Host Center” for a CRP.

2.8 Monitoring and Evaluation: Results Based Management

Each CRP full proposal will include details on a robust monitoring and evaluation system which provides necessary information to the CRP leadership, as well as to the Consortium and donors, on the rate of progress and ability of the CRP to adapt, and enables CRP management to implement results based management (RBM).

This system will track how the CRP is progressing toward the delivery of its results as specified in the Performance Indicator Matrix, in order to make necessary adjustments when progress is different from expectations. The adjustments, be they in terms of research directions, research methods, partnerships, including with development stakeholders, reflect possible amendments in the CRP’s theory of change. This tracking is applied at different levels of the CGIAR system: for the whole CRP portfolio, at the CRP (level n), at the FP (level n-1), and the CA (level n-2), for purposes of reporting to donors and for RBM, and of course at more detailed levels, for purposes internal to the CRP, including managing risks.

CGIAR’s 2016 - 2030 SRF describes CGIAR’s approach to results-based management (RBM), to be implemented in the CRPs, and articulated in the proposals. Where relevant, it will be useful to detail ability to manage the CRP adaptively, responding to new information and insights on how its theories of change are evolving by revising its implementation strategies.
In that respect, foresight analysis will be important instrument to monitor and enhance understanding of the evolving context in which the CRPs operate.

As evidence of commitment to RBM, full proposals should include:

- Demonstration of visible senior-level leadership and commitment in results-based management at both the Consortium and CRP levels.
- Promotion and support of a culture of results based on self-reflection and self-evaluation, evidence-based learning and encouragement of experimentation and change.
- A realistic results strategy framework with ownership at all levels.
- Sensible assessment of results and activities needed to achieve them, reflected in a plan that, to the extent possible, involves actors along the impact pathway.
- Documentation and reporting of longer-term results.
- Use of near term results information for learning, managing, and accountability.
- Implementation of results-based management over time, regularly reviewing and adapting practices as experience is gained.

CRP reporting, monitoring and evaluation requirements will be further specified in the Guidance for full proposals and are expected to be worked out in the full proposals.

3. **REVIEW PROCESS**

ISPC will be responsible for the external peer-review process of the pre-proposals and ISPC will submit its recommendations to the FC (who will share them with the CB for its decision making). Proposals will be reviewed based on assessment criteria as provided below.

**Approval process:** The Consortium receives proposals from the CRP Lead/Host Centers. Both the Consortium Office and Fund Office analyze the proposals, taking into account the ISPC review and recommendations, and provide recommendations for approval or otherwise to the CB and FC respectively. The Consortium will submit the proposals and FP approved by the CB to the FC, together with a recommended financial allocation. The FC is the final approver of the CRP proposals and sets the budget allocations for the CRPs.
4. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING CRP PRE-PROPOSALS

4.1 Criteria at CRP level

4.1.1 Cross-cutting themes (also to be applied to each Flagship)

- The plausibility of the Theory of Change and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDOs and IDOs and the feasibility of the Impact Pathways.

- The rigor and credibility of the scientific arguments underpinning the rationale for the pre-proposal, including the cohesion of the FPs.

- Have the ‘grand challenges’, in particular climate change, been recognized in planning the research?

- Evidence that gender issues have been considered within the proposed research framework and appropriate questions/hypotheses are being posed.

- Evidence that youth issues have been considered within the proposed research framework and appropriate questions/hypotheses are being posed.

- Recognition of the importance of the enabling environment.

- Commitment to capacity development through adoption of some of the nine elements of the CapDev Framework.

4.1.2 Budget

- The extent to which the resources requested, relative to the expected outcomes, represent an attractive and appropriate investment for donors, that is, is the proposal good value for money.

4.1.3 Cohesion

- Do the individual flagships add up to a CRP that is bigger than the sum of the individual parts?

- Is there evidence that the CRP as a whole will make a significant contribution to delivery at the CGIAR system level?

- Has the CRP indicated focus countries for which the CRP intends to work together with other CRPs on the preparation of site integration plans, including carrying out necessary consultations with national partners and stakeholders to align with national priorities and activities?
4.1.4 Governance and management

- Evidence of leadership and management commitment with an appropriate governance structure that is assessed as having the potential to successfully implement the proposed program.

- Are the governance arrangements proposed in line with the CRP Governance and Management Review?

- The track record of the Leadership Team (recruitment criteria if leaders not in place), that is, the leaders of the FPs plus the CRP leader.

- Application of a convincing strategy to select partners (e.g. through GCARD3 and other mechanisms). What is the CRP strategy for selecting partners and for interacting with other CRPs.

4.2 Criteria at Flagship level

- Strategic relevance, assessed via degree of alignment of question or problem to be addressed and expected outputs with sub-IDOs in the SRF and with national and regional priorities and initiatives (identified through GCARD3)

- Recognition of the need for the research to account for potential unintended consequences on SLOS which are not the primary focus of the research

- Assessment of scientific quality, the novelty of what is being proposed, the track record of the proposal leadership team on the basis of delivery in current CRP (with respect to publications and demonstration of commitment to quality within the CRP) and through use of peer review mechanisms at the project proposal level

- Comparative advantage of the CGIAR and Host Centre, together with proposed partners in the specified research area, to be assessed based on whether the research being proposed is particularly appropriate at this time, the topics to be covered offer long term benefit over and above what others are doing and if appropriate resources are being requested

- The plausibility of the Theory of Change and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDOs and IDOs and the feasibility of the Impact Pathways

- Strategic fit and relevance of named partners: Do the partners included add value in terms of scientific contribution and enhance the probability of impact been identified?

- Lessons learned from previous research, in particular the first round of CRPs – is there evidence of building on earlier work, e.g. how things have changed or even been dropped on the basis of past learning?
5. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING CRP FULL PROPOSALS

While the Criteria for assessing full proposals may be adjusted after the pre-proposal stage, the expected criteria for evaluating full proposals are shown here to demonstrate what will and will not be required at pre-proposal stage (versus what will be evaluated at full proposal stage).

5.1 Criteria at CRP level

5.1.1 Cross-cutting issues (also to be applied to each flagship)

- **Gender**: Are the gender sub-IDOs in the SRF being addressed? Do the research questions posed in the proposal reflect an awareness of the constraints on women and the objective of addressing them?

- **Climate change**: Are the relevant climate change sub-IDOs in the SRF being addressed? Does the strategy reflect sufficient awareness of the potential impact of climate change on agriculture in developing countries?

- **Enabling environment**: Are the relevant enabling environment sub-IDOs in the SRF being addressed? Does the proposal include the appropriate expertise to address the constraints of the enabling environment?

- **Capacity development**: Are the capacity development sub-IDOs in the SRF addressed? Are the proposed activities in capacity development adequate and appropriate (in relation to the CGIAR CapDev Framework)? Is there evidence that these have been discussed with stakeholders?

- **Intellectual asset management, Open Access/Open Data**: Evidence that intellectual assets and Open Access and Open Data will be managed according to best practices, with sufficient resource allocation to enable best practices. Are a convincing intellectual asset management strategy and OA-OD implementation plans in place? Have sufficient resources been budgeted for this? Are there CRP and/or Center staff identified with the appropriate skills to deliver on this issue?

5.1.2 Budget and staff time

- **Staff time**: Does the amount of staff time included seem appropriate to the degree of priority for this area of work? Does the time allowed for management seem appropriate? Is the mix of senior and junior staff time appropriate?

- **Budget**: Is there evidence from the budget that opportunities have been taken to gain efficiency savings through work with other CRPs and partners? Are all large budget items sufficiently justified?
5.1.3 Cohesion

- Is the CRP narrative convincing as a comprehensive program of research rather than simply a collection of FPs?

- Is there sufficient evidence that there has been interaction with other CRPs during development of this one in order to capture efficiency savings, particularly transaction costs of partners?

- Does this CRP make a convincing case as to how it will make a contribution at the CGIAR-system level?

- Has the CRP worked together with other CRPs in the development of Site Integration Plans in a set of key geographies, supported by national consultations with partners and stakeholders to align with national priorities and activities?

5.1.4 Governance and management

- **Leadership**: Does the proposed CRP leadership team show evidence of the right mix of scientific excellence and proven ability to plan and deliver research programs? Do members have a track record in publications? Have they selected the most appropriate partners?

- **Management**: Is there evidence that sufficient rigor will be applied to reviewing proposals for specific projects within the program? Is there evidence of a strong communication plan to ensure that all participants in the program can access knowledge of what else is being done?

- **Work Plan**: Is the work plan convincing?

- **Partnership**: Are the number of partners realistic? Is there sufficient justification for the selection of: (a) partnerships intended to contribute science and (b) partnerships to facilitate delivery through to development outcomes? Are modalities for partnerships clearly outlined including various roles and responsibilities of partners (including in governance/management)?
5.2 Criteria at Flagship level

- **Scientific quality**: Is the proposed research novel? Does the proposal show recognition of the potential of recent scientific advances to contribute to addressing the research hypotheses being proposed? Is there a convincing plan for developing the research questions over the lifetime of the CRP? Are mechanisms for peer review of proposals and seeking scientific advice on strategy as the program evolves convincing? Where partners have been chosen for the scientific value they would add, are they the most appropriate partners?

- **Strategic relevance**: Is the Theory of Change well developed with respect to the SRF? Does the proposal consider potential unintended consequences on the 2 non-primary SLOs? Are the contributions to specified sub-IDOs clear? Does the proposal align with key regional and national priorities and initiatives? Are there numerical targets for beneficiaries to be reached? Is the geographical priority appropriate in terms of need and commitment of the intended beneficiary governments to the main objective? Is the contribution to the CGIAR System level clear?

- **Comparative advantage**: Is a logical case made as to why the CGIAR should be leading in this area of research and are the named partners appropriate in the context of the Theory of Change? Does the proposal include a sufficient summary of the state of knowledge in the area? Does it build on lessons learnt from earlier research?
6. **Pre-Proposal template**

Pre-proposals will contain the following sections, each of which will be crafted in accordance with the foregoing section on background, the SRF, and the Common Operational Framework:

**CRP level (10 pages)**

- Overview to describe strategic relevance and question/problem to be addressed which includes: (a) alignment with the SRF; (b) the added value of being a program i.e. degree of cohesion across flagships and (c) strategy for ensuring that international public goods are delivered, Theory of Change and Impact Pathways (maximum 3 pages)

- Evidence of demand (0.5 page)

- Comparative advantage of the CGIAR together with proposed partners in delivering in specified research areas (including lessons learnt from earlier research) (1 page)

- Strategic fit and relevance of partnerships (1 page)

- Stakeholder commitment e.g. include reference to the SDGs (1 page)

- Leadership, management and governance structure and proposed activities (1 page)

- Management budget at Flagship and total CRP levels (appropriateness of the funding and value for money)

- **Annex 2**: proposed Performance Indicator Matrix, specifying all results/outcomes for the contract period (costed in the pre-proposal budget).

- **Annex 3**: proposed budget by outcome.

- Table of target beneficiaries and target countries at CRP level and aggregated.

**Table of target beneficiaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results or outcomes</th>
<th>Target IDOs and sub-IDOs</th>
<th>Total number of poor smallholders</th>
<th>Total number of other beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target countries</th>
<th>Key assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flagship level (up to 4 pages plus budget Table and Annexes per Flagship)**

*Flagships are expected to be research entities of 20-100 million dollars over the period, be defined on geographical or thematic basis with articulation of how they contribute to IDOs – and to be the unit of evaluation of pre-proposals in 2015*

- Science quality and problem/question to be addressed i.e. novelty of ideas potential for innovation in practice

- Geography i.e. detail on regions (Table of target beneficiaries)
• Beneficiaries (more detail on gender and equality issues, table of target beneficiaries)
• Strategic relevance (including recognition of how unintended consequences will be dealt with) and comparative advantage including lessons learnt from previous research
• Skills, experience and capacity of proposed Flagship leader to deliver in this research area, including recent publications and evidence of delivery (Annex, 1 page max per person)
• Added value of partners – outline strategy for selecting partners
• Indicative budget and justification by result or outcome specified in the Performance Indicator Matrix (PIM) Table
• Illustrate how climate change and other grand challenges will be taken into account
• Describe key aspects of the relevant enabling environment
• Outline plans and commitment for capacity development

Optional elements

Cross-cutting co-ordination (4 cross-cutting themes + nutrition + impact) 4 pages max
• Relevance of this CRP taking co-ordination lead for specified Cross-cutting theme
• Strategy for system-wide networking
• Strategy for strengthening expertise across the system
• Efficiency of proposed reporting mechanisms
• Co-ordination mechanism
• Budget

Sources of Funds

Budget Levels

• CRP (Level n): Macro level of the budget at the CRP level.

• Flagship Projects (FPs): These are the next tier, showing the drill-down information to level n-1. Best estimates should be provided for the 5-year period from 2017-2021. Each project is estimated to require between $20m and $100m of financial resources through its term. Each FP is expected to deliver one or more results as specified in the Performance Indicator Matrix and budget estimates are expected for each result at the pre-proposal stage, regardless of the source of funds, that is total costs, including W1-2 as well as W3-bilateral. Estimates by source of funds will be requested at the full proposal stage.

• For the full proposal: Cluster of Activities (CA): This tier comprises of sub-projects at level n-2. Budget allocation per team or partner should be shown for each activity. These should be in tandem with the FP cycle and thus the forecast should be for 2017-2021 in the full proposal.

Budget indications

• Partnerships: In the pre-proposals, the estimated budget for partnerships, should include allocation by types of partners (e.g. partners at the discovery research level; partners at the proof of concept and pilot level; and partners for scaling up). Clear delineation should exist
between partner budgets that are self-funded; those that are co-funded by the CRP and the partner; and those that are entirely funded by the CRP. Full proposals are expected to detail budgets for each strategic partner.

- The funding budgeted and reported as the partner share may also be included in the share of the budget allocated to gender research and capacity development. For example, a capacity development program focused on gender in research and implemented through a university, could be counted in each of these categories (i.e. that is not “double counting”)

- The expected share of the W1-2 budget that will go to non-CGIAR partners will have to be specified in both the CRP pre-proposals (in outline) and in the full proposal (in detail) together with the roles and responsibilities partners will have in governance and management, (co-)leadership of Flagship Projects, and generation of results.

- Capacity Development: At the Flagship Project level, there should be a credible allocation of the total budget to capacity development.

- Gender in Research: adequate resources should be earmarked for CRP gender strategies.

- Intellectual Asset Management, Open Access and Data Management: In the full proposal the budget should include resources required to implement an Intellectual Asset Management and an Open Access and Data Management strategy to order to maximize accessibility and impact of research outputs. It is recommended that this budget be developed in consultation with key Center and CRP legal/IP, knowledge management, and data management staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRA</td>
<td>Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIS</td>
<td>Advanced research institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBSRC</td>
<td>Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council - UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>See Cluster of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER OF ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Subprojects within a Flagship Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>CGIAR Consortium Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPS</td>
<td>CGIAR Research Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CGIAR Consortium Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. In the CGIAR evaluation refers to an external, completely (IEA commissioned) or largely (CRP commissioned) independent and systematic study of an in-depth nature that uses clear evaluation criteria. In addition to research, it applies also to central CGIAR institutions, support programs and themes, and the System as a whole. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making processes of major stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>CGIAR Fund Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>CGIAR Fund Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>See Flagship Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGSHIP PROJECTS</td>
<td>Flagship Projects are large research components which add up to make a complete CRP. Flagship projects have specific objectives and each FP may produce several outputs and research outcomes in order to achieve, in due course, specific IDOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Intellectual Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDO</td>
<td>Intermediate Development Outcome: At CGIAR’s research program level targets representing CRP-specific thrusts and target domains that are generated as a result of multiple activities by diverse actors outside the CGIAR. Their scales reflect CRP target domain and estimated volume of benefits. At System level IDOs represent accumulation of CRP outcome results with the scale corresponding to the CGIAR’s target domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Arrangement of the CGIAR is an independent unit that manages and supports external evaluations which aim to provide accountability, support to decision making, and lessons for improving quality and effectiveness of agricultural research for development outcomes. IEA evaluations cover all parts of the CGIAR system, including CRPs and other institutions such as the Consortium. A ‘system-wide evaluation’ is commissioned every seven-ten years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPC</td>
<td>Independent Science and Partnership Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMS</td>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects resulting from a chain of events to which research has contributed, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These effects can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>In the CGIAR this term is generally used for an ex post study which uses specialized methods to estimate the changes in selected development parameters and the extent to which these are attributable to defined research activities or programs of the CGIAR. The Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA) has an oversight and capacity building function for impact assessment in the CGIAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT PATHWAY</td>
<td>Impact Pathway; the causal pathway for a research project or program that outlines the expected sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes and impacts. Assumptions underpinning the causal chain and feed-back loops are usually included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>A process of continuous or periodic collection and analysis of data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected progress and results, in order to track performance against plans and targets, to identify reasons for under or over achievement, and to take necessary actions to improve performance. Monitoring is usually the responsibility of program management and operational staff, while evaluation as defined in the CGIAR Policy and Standards is carried out by external evaluators. Monitoring is also used for research purposes to guide decisions on research design and adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National agricultural research systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOS</td>
<td>Non-Government Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation - USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>Performance Indicator Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWB</td>
<td>Program of Work of Budget (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOS</td>
<td>System level outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>Strategy and Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEORY OF CHANGE</td>
<td>See TOC below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change: Presents a hypothetical identification of the ways by which change is expected to occur from output to outcome and impact along an impact pathway. The TOC questions the assumptions about causality underlying the relationships between outputs, outcomes and impact. In TOC the assumptions present the mechanisms of change. There is no single method or presentational form agreed for TOCs. In research it is often used as a framework for testing hypotheses and incrementally building up the evidence base for the assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABLE</td>
<td>See SDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT GOAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMS</td>
<td>EXPLANATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>One of the main outcomes of the Rio+20 Conference was the agreement by member States to launch a process to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will build upon the Millennium Development Goals and converge with the post 2015 development agenda. SDGs must be based on Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation; Fully respect all the Rio Principles; Be consistent with international law; Build upon commitments already made; Contribute to the full implementation of the outcomes of all major summits in the economic, social and environmental fields; Focus on priority areas for the achievement of sustainable development, being guided by the outcome document; Address and incorporate in a balanced way all three dimensions of sustainable development and their inter-linkages; Be coherent with and integrated into the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015; Not divert focus or effort from the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals; Include active involvement of all relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, in the process; Be action-oriented; Concise; Easy to communicate; Limited in number; Aspirational; Global in nature; Universally applicable to all countries while taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1-W2-W3</td>
<td>CGIAR Fund Donors may designate their contribution to one or more of three funding “Windows”: W1, W2 or W3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Window 1 - Contributions represent the least restricted type of funding. The Fund Council allocates Window 1 Funds to CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs), based upon a request from the Consortium Board for specific allocations to each CRP. It also decides upon appropriate payment of System Costs and any other use required to achieve the CGIAR mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Window 2 – Contributions are designated by Fund Donors to one or more specific CRPs. For each approved CRP, a sub-account is created to which donors may allocate funds. Once Window 2 funds are allocated to a given CRP, they flow to the Lead Center implementing the CRP, based upon the specific requests from the Consortium Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Window 3 – Contributions are the most restricted type of funding, consisting of funds that Fund Donors wish to allocate to specific Centers. Neither the Consortium nor the Fund Council makes decisions about the use of Window 3 funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **ANNEX 2. Indicative Performance Indicator Matrix template**

The Performance Indicator Matrix for the pre-proposals is expected to be similar to the matrix shown below that was used for the Extension proposals, but for different time horizons, e.g. for the first 5 years (2017-2021), 10 years (2017-2026) and 2030 (the SDG time horizon). A more detailed Performance Matrix will be required as part of the full proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship Projects</th>
<th>Expected outcomes 2015 (Quantified)</th>
<th>Expected outcomes 2016 (Quantified)</th>
<th>Means of verification*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Project 1:</td>
<td>Outcome 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.3</td>
<td>&lt;provide means of verification&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Project 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Project 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Project 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Project 5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The outcomes should be aggregated from cluster-level to the flagship level. The matrix should not contain outcomes at the Cluster Activities-level.

To present all outcomes at the flagship-level, additional rows can be inserted for each Flagship Project as needed.

Metrics for these outcomes must be consistent with the CRP’s Annual Reports and its POWBs.

* For verification please provide web links, contact person or other appropriate means of verification.
9. ANNEX 3. Indicative Pre-proposal budget template

The indicative budget for the pre-proposal is proposed to provide a single (total) estimate for the cost of all activities required to generate each results or outcomes for each FP (all sources of funds combined), when activities contribute to multiple outcomes their cost would be allocated to multiple results.

For the pre-proposal it is proposed to provide costs for the same timelines as used in the Performance Indicator Matrix, that is, 2017-2021, 2017-2026 and 2017-2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLAGSHIP PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL 2017 - 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Flagship Project 1
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 1 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 2
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 2 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 3
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 3 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 4
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 4 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 5
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 5 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 6
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 6 Costs** |
| Flagship Project 7
  Outcome 1
  Outcome 2
  Outcome 3
| **Total Flagship Project 7 Costs** |
| **Total CRP Budget*** |

*This is the sum of the total Flagship Project costs.
10. ANNEX 4. CRP governance and management

Outline of responsibilities and composition of the entities and individuals involved in CRP governance and management.

**Independent Steering Committee (ISC)**

Each CRP should have a single Independent Steering Committee (ISC) that reports directly to the Lead Center board on the performance of the CRP.

**Responsibilities:** The ISC is the central decision-making body of the CRP. As such, its responsibilities include:

- Providing strategic direction to, and oversight of, the CRP, including priority setting and the evaluation of results;
- Approving the Program of Work and Budget (POWB) developed by the CRP’s management committee;
- Overseeing external evaluations of CRP programs and activities;
- Maintaining awareness of stakeholder perspectives and needs;
- Serving as a programmatic report for the CRP leader;
- Reporting at least annually to the Lead Center Board (through the Board Chair or the Program Committee Chair of the Lead Center);
- Serving as an expert resource to the CRP and the senior management team.

**Composition:** The ISC should be a balanced body with a high level of expertise, inclusiveness and independence in order to avoid conflicts of interest and to assure donors, partners and stakeholders that no interests but the best interests of the CRP will shape deliberations.

Its composition should include:

- A majority of independent members (external to the CRP), including the Chair;
- Individuals known and respected for their professional expertise;
- A balance in gender representation as well as expertise in gender;
- A geographic balance with representation from CRP target regions;
- Partner and stakeholder representation, including:
  - The Lead Center Director General as an *ex officio* member;
  - The CRP Leader as an *ex officio* member;
  - 2 or 3 participating Center Directors General (who cannot represent a majority on the ISC) whose role should be to represent all participating Centers.

A representative of the CGIAR Consortium should have the right to attend meetings as an observer.

The size of the ISC should be functional, enabling participation and making management and support of the ISC reasonable for CRP management. **Appointment of members:** ISC members should be appointed by the Lead Center board for a fixed term, renewable once at the recommendation of the ISC. The ISC Chair should be appointed by the ISC’s members for a fixed term. The basis for including partners or stakeholder representatives should be clearly articulated with the expectation that representative members will participate in their individual capacity and minimize both conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest.
**CRP Leader**

**Responsibilities:** Each CRP should have a CRP Leader who provides strong intellectual leadership with regard to the CRP and is responsible for managing the CRP.

**Hiring:** The CRP Leader should be hired by the Lead Center upon the recommendation of a hiring committee established by the ISC in which the Lead Center DG participates. Targets agreed by the CGIAR with the Fund Council for CGIAR Gender and Diversity in the Workplace should be taken into account.

**Reporting:** The CRP Leader reports programmatically to the ISC and administratively to the Lead Center Director General. This dual reporting should allow the CRP Leader to work on a day-to-day basis with the Lead Center Director General while benefiting from the ISC’s overall guidance. The CRP Leader’s annual performance review should be conducted jointly by the ISC and the Lead Center Director General.

**Authority to Manage for Results:** The CRP Leader should have the authority to manage for results. The CRP Leader should have the flexibility to put management and program advisory structures in place that are responsive to program and partnership needs. Additionally, the CRP Leader should chair the CRP Management Committee and play a role in the evaluation of the CRP Management Committee members (as described under 3 below).

**CRP Management Committee**

Each CRP should have a CRP Management Committee, chaired by the CRP Leader and made up of Principal Investigators (PIs) of each of the partners. These PIs should report both to the CRP Leader and to their line manager in their employing entity. The Management Committee should include the gender research coordinator or other senior research PI with expertise in gender research. The annual performance evaluation of PIs should be conducted by their employing entity, with significant input from the CRP Leader.