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(DRAFT 1) Guidance for Full Proposals

Purpose:

This document sets out an initial draft (Draft 1) version of the 2nd Call Full Proposal Guidance for review by CGIAR stakeholders (Fund Council, ISPC, IEA, current CRPs and Centers).

As well as a description of the elements of the expected submissions, this draft introduces the overarching principles for programs and the basis for allocation of resources, as these two items have particular relevance in the shaping of the 2nd call.

The Consortium kindly requests stakeholders to share inputs on this draft document by Tuesday 27 October, directed to: crp-proposals@cgiar.org

These inputs will be used to prepare a revised version that will also incorporate outcomes from the Fund Council’s deliberations over 4 – 5 November 2015 on the scope and size of the CRP2 Portfolio.

The Call for Full Proposals Guidance is expected to be released on Tuesday 17 November 2015, after final approval by the Consortium Board.

Note: This Draft does not include details of the portfolio against which the second call will be made, as this awaits the outcome of deliberations at the Fund Council’s Fourteenth meeting over 4- 5 November 2015. Similarly, this document describes the process of the call using the names of CGIAR entities as they are currently, and adjustments will be made as needed at the time of release of the final Guidance document.
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1. The call and the approval process

CGIAR is a global research partnership that is a leading provider of research and development in agriculture (including crops, livestock, aquaculture and forestry).

Our vision is a world free of poverty, hunger and environmental degradation.

Our mission is to advance agri-food science and innovation to enable poor people, especially poor women, to increase agricultural productivity and resilience; share in economic growth and feed themselves and their families better; and manage natural resources in the face of climate change and other threats.

CGIAR’s 2016 – 2030 Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)\(^1\) defines CGIAR’s aspirations and strategic actions to deliver on our mission.

Our SRF is ambitious: By 2030, the action of CGIAR and its partners will result in 150 million fewer hungry people, 100 million fewer poor people – at least 50% of whom are women, and 190 million ha less degraded land. CGIAR system entities plan to deliver on the SRF by focusing on three goals (System Level Outcomes or SLOs), and their respective underlying intermediate development outcomes (or IDOs), refer figure 1 below.

Figure 1: SRF system level and intermediate development outcomes

Implementation of the 2016-2030 SRF is planned in phases, with 2017-2022 representing the initial 6-year operational period. CGIAR plans to realize these shared outcomes through the creation of a comprehensive new portfolio of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) that build on successes to date, lessons learnt, and new science and technology that bring exciting opportunities.

With the SRF providing the overall strategic direction, research priorities and Results Framework\(^2\), this Guidance document (Guidance) sets out:

- The overarching framework and timetable for the 2nd Call for CRPs (CRP 2nd Call); and
- The specific requirements and assessment criteria for full proposals for phase II CRPs.

\(^1\) Approved by the CGIAR Consortium Board at its twentieth meeting (CB/B20/DP04). Find it here: [CGIAR 2016 - 2030 SRF](#).

\(^2\) This Guidance is subsidiary to the SRF, so that in case of differences, the SRF prevails.
Launching the 2nd call for Full Proposals for CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)

The CGIAR Consortium invites specified CGIAR Centers and their partners to submit by not later than 31 March 2016:

- A coherent set of interconnected proposals for the period 2017-2022 to address the selected global challenges identified in CGIAR’s 2016 – 2030 SRF; and

- A proposal from a Community of Practice in capacity development to prioritize and implement a system wide strategy over 2017 – 2019 to strengthen the foundation for effective implementation and performance.

Specifically, the [X] (subject to Fund Council endorsement) interconnected CRP2 Portfolio proposals submitted in response to this call:

- Should represent innovative programs of research that respond to the new CRP portfolio (CRP2 Portfolio) to be described in the Final Guidance;

- Should follow the format (content) set out in Chapter 2 of this draft of the Guidance document and conform with the format and length to be found in the on-line submission tool; and

- Will be evaluated according to the criteria set out in Chapter 4 of this draft of the Guidance document, and aligned with the criteria for the ISPC independent peer review of full proposals to be submitted in 2016.

The roadmap to final approval

To enhance the overall excellence and value for money of the CRP2 Portfolio, the CRP 2nd Call has been designed to proceed according to three key phases: (i) pre-proposals (completed at the time of launch of this 2nd Call for Full Proposals, and not described below); (ii) full proposals (this call); and (iii) getting down to work as set out in table 1 below.

Submission of Full Proposals

- The Programs to be invited for Full Proposals will be described (in a section of the Final Guidance) after the decision of the Fund Council on November the 4th. They are not elaborated in this draft.

- Proposals must be submitted through the on-line submission tool on CGIAR.org by not later than 31 March 2016. Late proposals will not be accepted.

- To facilitate on time review, and submission to the Consortium Board for approval post ISPC review, proposals must adhere to the requirements and template length set out (indicatively in this Guidance), as enforced through the submission tool.

- A template submission format will be provided in due course.
Table 1: Timeline for the CRP 2nd Call for Full Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov 2015 - Nov 2016</th>
<th>(ii). Full proposal stage and review for invited proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 November</td>
<td>Consortium Board invites approved proposals to submit full proposals and initiates other follow-up actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20 November</td>
<td>ISPC-Consortium-Center meeting to discuss ISPC pre-proposal review and ISPC/Fund Council guidance for full proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 November 2015 – 31 March 2016</td>
<td>Centers prepare and submit full CRP2 Portfolio proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early April 2016 (date TBC)</td>
<td>GCARD3 in South Africa (and national consultations during Q1 of 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April – 16 June 2016</td>
<td>ISPC pre-review of CRP full proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June 2016</td>
<td>ISPC-Consortium –Centers-donors meeting to discuss ISPC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June – 31 July 2016</td>
<td>Centers revise proposals (and share with new CGIAR System Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 August – 30 September 2016</td>
<td>ISPC (Re-)Review of CRP full proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November 2016</td>
<td>CGIAR System Council decisions on CRP proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November – 10 December 2016</td>
<td>Center revisions of CGIAR System Council must-haves, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 December 2016</td>
<td>ISPC final check of CGIAR System Council must haves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November - 31 December 2016</td>
<td>New CRP legal agreements put in place between CGIAR System Council and lead Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Jan 2017</td>
<td><em>(iii) CRP 2 Portfolio implementation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts 1 January 2017</td>
<td>A rolling 6-year program of research with committed funding for the initial 3 years, renewable depending on progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritizing the available resources

Core budget (base level resource mobilization scenario) and uplift budgets (enhanced resource mobilization scenario) will be requested for the X CRPs that represent a balance between upstream, translational, and delivery focused research.

Window 1 and 2 funding will be preferentially allocated for strategic research purposes and site integration initiatives, and result in international public good outcomes that are defined through the Full Proposals for both core and uplift budgets. Strategic research purposes are defined as those which support critical mass in areas where CGIAR has opportunities to have the largest impacts on the goals of the SRF. They include the upstream, discovery part of the agenda, plus integrative system functions which foster impacts from place-based research.

Window 3 and bilaterally funded initiatives will be identified, before implementation starts, as either CRP or non-CRP Center initiatives by the CRP leader.

CRP W3 and bilateral initiatives that demonstrably implement parts of the approved CRP programs, will be monitored, reported and evaluated as part of the CRPs.

Scaling up and out, or integrated delivery parts of CRPs are expected to be preferentially funded from W3 and bilateral funds. CRP W3 and bilateral initiatives can be co-funded through limited amounts of W1 and W2 funding.

Center W3 and bilateral projects that are not part of the CRPs cannot be co-funded through W1-2 resources.

Placeholder for a table that provides core (W1-2 and W3-Bilateral) and uplift (W1-2 and W3-Bilateral) budgets for all X CRP proposals invited through this call.
2. **Key elements of the call**

The following section outlines key elements that must be included in a proposal (and builds on earlier development of proposed Flagships from the pre-proposal stage).

2.1 **Program descriptions: Flagships, clusters of activities and cross cutting activities.**

At the highest level, proposals should:

- Demonstrate a meaningful contribution to the targets identified in the SRF;
- 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 concept notes for a number of Flagships through which the program aims to contribute to development outcomes in specific geographies or thematic areas.

The full proposal must then 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.

**Flagship projects and clusters of activities**

Each proposal will need to specify:

a. How it is broken down into up to 7 structured **Flagships**. Each Flagship will have specific objectives that address sub-IDOs and may produce several outputs and research outcomes to achieve 2 to 3 of the CGIAR targets specified in the SRF; and

b. For internal CRP management purposes, clearly articulated **Clusters of Activities** (CoA) that are sub-projects of each Flagship (in general 5 to 8). Each CoA should result in products, services or attributes linked to the objectives, or research outputs. A detailed budget will be developed at the level of each Flagship and the W1/W2 funding requested.

---

3 Flagship projects (‘Flagships’) 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.
for each CoA plus its overall outcome focus will be required for each cluster of activities (but not a detailed budget by line item). The contributions expected of CoAs and Flagships to cross-cutting themes will need to be specified in the narrative and a specific allocation of funds to gender will need to be identified (as specified in section 2.4).

2.2 Site integration plans

A key means of focusing CGIAR’s CRP2 Program effort around outcomes will be the adoption of site integration plans for key CGIAR countries.

According to the SRF: “The CRPs will coordinate with each other to ensure that, in key geographies, their activities are aligned for maximum impact. The CRPs’ collective, coordinated commitments in these geographies will be summarized in site integration plans to enable transparent interaction with local stakeholders. The consultation process will be pursued through the GCARD.”

The definition of site integration plans will be occurring in late 2015 and early 2016 and full proposals will be required to show in their submission how they participate or contribute to the future site development and what this means in program terms. The target countries selected by the CRPs for such site integration efforts are as follows:

Table 2: The CRPs proposed the following list of 6 countries for (more intensive) Site Integration++, i.e. the highest priority for site integration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3: Additionally, the CRPs proposed list of countries for Site Integration+:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This step will provide added impetus to the focus of CGIAR research and provide a more concrete framing for the Results Framework.
Thus, site integration plans are being developed for each country and will include a description for each of the elements listed in the table 4 below of:

1. the current situation
2. the future plan/situation (based on requirements and targets listed in the table)
3. how will future plans/situations be achieved.

Table 4: Elements for site integration plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site integration requirements</th>
<th>Target(s) for site integration ++ countries*</th>
<th>Target(s) for site integration+ countries**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing a sustained mechanism for collaboration amongst CGIAR entities</td>
<td>Site Integration Steering Committee involving all CGIAR entities operating in the country established and managing site integration activities through appropriate assigned roles, frequency of meetings and confirmed decision-making process.</td>
<td>Site Integration Steering Committee involving all CGIAR entities operating in the country established and managing site integration activities through appropriate assigned roles, frequency of meetings and confirmed decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Carrying out ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners and stakeholders to understand and align with the national priorities and actions, i.e., demand for CGIAR research, and to establish and maintain partnerships | • GCARD3 National Consultation to be carried out in 2015  
 • Established mechanism for regular dialogue and engagement with key partners and stakeholders to maintain relationships  
 • Joint partnership strategy for CGIAR entities in that country | • GCARD3 National Consultation to be carried out in Q1 of 2016  
 • Plan for regular dialogue and engagement with key partners and stakeholders to maintain relationships  
 • Alignment of partnership strategies amongst CGIAR entities in that country |
| • Collectively meeting the goals and targets of the SRF related to the particular country  
  – Identification of key goals and targets of the SRF and the way in which these will be worked towards by collective CGIAR presence  
  – Identification of clear country outcomes | • A set of common sub-IDOs with indicators, targets and metrics developed and used  
 • A single monitoring, evaluation and measurement system in place | • A set of common sub-IDOs with indicators, targets and metrics  
 • A single monitoring, evaluation and measurement system in place |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site integration requirements</th>
<th>Target(s) for site integration ++ countries*</th>
<th>Target(s) for site integration+ countries**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Aligning research activities (also consider combined systems work; gender and inclusive growth)</td>
<td>A clear set of joint research activities developed and implemented</td>
<td>Alignment of research plans amongst CGIAR entities and mechanism to maintain alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Producing joint research outputs and public goods including knowledge, technologies, tools, methods, evidence, processes and platforms.</td>
<td>A key number of research outputs and processes jointly produced.</td>
<td>A key number of research outputs and processes jointly produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making use of a common set of research sites</td>
<td>More than 50% of the research sites in the country are used by the collective CGIAR presence</td>
<td>A credible set of good examples of shared research sites is documented and available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Sharing CGIAR facilities, infrastructure and equipment | Reduction to a single CGIAR office by 2019 | • Implementation of a shared service model to provide a suite of shared services to achieve efficiency and effectiveness by 2019  
• Reduction to a single CGIAR office by 2022 |

Full proposals will therefore be expected to provide:

a. an indication of the site integration (+ and ++) countries that this CRP is involved in

b. documentation of the engagement and consultation activities that this CRP has been involved in towards achieving site integration planning (both internally and externally)

c. evidence that processes have been documented and shared publicly, e.g. through the GCARD3 website ([www.gcard3.cgiar.org](http://www.gcard3.cgiar.org))

d. reference to the site integration plans developed for each of the countries applicable to this CRP

e. implementation of the CRPs share of each site integration plan it participates in through identifiable research activities and associated funding detailed in the Full Proposal
2.3 Partnership strategy

A wide range of successful partnerships are essential for CGIAR to achieve its goals. CRP full proposals will therefore need to include a detailed partnership strategy that outlines:

(i) Who and what type of partners:

The partnership strategy will identify the strategic partners of the CRP. It is recognized that CRPs will likely engage with hundreds of partners, and the partnership strategy will define their engagement broadly, but it will focus on the small number of strategic partners that are critical to achieving the CRPs outcomes, and describe their role, responsibilities and budgets explicitly. The strategy should indicate the full range of partners that will be involved in the CRP, with important considerations of:

a. Relevant research partners
b. Government, policy and public sector partners
c. Development partners
d. Private sector actors- CRP theories of change should explicitly acknowledge the role of the private sector in CGIAR’s mission

(ii) Roles of partners:

The strategy should highlight the role that partners will play and the avenues for their involvement, e.g. at the discovery, proof of concept, and pilot level (if relevant) and scaling-up phases along the impact pathways.

Also CRPs are specifically expected to 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.

(iii) Partnership Modalities:

The strategy should explain the various ways in which partnerships may be engaged in, for example, joint calls for proposals with national research organizations and funding agencies, or research programs with researchers from national research agencies and universities, to joint research with NARS, ARIs, private sector and other appropriate research entities.

(iv) Strategic Partnership Activities:

The strategy should document additional strategic partnership activities such as:

a. Ongoing engagement and dialogue with stakeholders and partners starting with how the CRP has interacted with the GCARD3 process, including any other consultations
that have taken place in support of the proposal and how the CRP intends to continue ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners and stakeholders; and

b. Existing efforts and plans for future **alignment with and support of regional initiatives** [such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP)]. Note: 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 existing efforts and plans for **involvement with key global processes**.

(v) **Sustaining partnerships**:

The Partnership Strategy should showcase how key factors that can contribute to the success of partnerships will be integrated, including: 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.

(vi) **Partnering capacity**:

The strategy should demonstrate the capacity of the CRP to successfully partner and carry out its partnerships strategy including specialized and experienced staff, existing mechanisms, tools and technologies, capacity enhancement methods, etc.

(vii) **Appropriate resourcing of partnerships**:

CRP full proposals should indicate how partners and partnerships will be resourced and indicate transparently the share of the CRP budget allocated to strategic partners. This may be through the allocation of a credible percentage (e.g. 20-30%) of total project funding to the different partnerships (to be identified in the sub-award budget category\(^4\) of the budget tables and in the narrative), 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.

---

\(^4\) All budget line items will be defined in the on-line tool
2.4 Gender strategy

CGIAR is committed to inclusive impact, creating opportunities for women, young people and marginalized groups through equitable access to resources, information and power in agriculture. Proposals should demonstrate that ensuring gender-responsive outcomes is an integral component of a CRP’s strategy for maximizing impact.

Full Proposals must include a fully elaborated gender research strategy. The proposal’s gender strategy should refer to an existing CRP’s approved Gender Strategy. The proposal should explain the significance of the proposed research to the SRF’s gender IDOs and sub-IDOs and address gender issues in its theory of change, impact pathways, work plans, monitoring and evaluation approach, and reporting, at CRP and Flagship level.

Proposals are required to include a Gender Summary as an annex of, respectively, up to two pages each, that provide:

- **Synthesis** of the gender analysis (with major papers or reports referenced) that was done before the proposal’s research priorities and questions were set, and how that informed the priority setting;
- **Overview** of how gender will be operationalized in the research agenda, and how progress towards gender-responsive outcomes will be tracked and ultimately evaluated; and
- **Target beneficiary population** numbers should be sex-disaggregated.

Where feasible, it is more accurate to express target beneficiaries as male and female individuals rather than as households, for the purpose of gender equity.

**Budget** - budgeted costs must show the special designation of funds needed to accomplish the expected gender-responsive outcomes, as specified in the Performance Indicator Matrix. The narrative must provide and explain the total budget allocation. Additionally, budget allocated to the specific achievement of the sub-IDO on gender and youth must be identified, with a footnote distinguishing if this allocation is for gender- or for youth-related outcomes. An annex of terms and examples relating to the description of gender and for the gender budget submission is attached (illustrative Annex 1).

2.5 Capacity development strategy

To properly translate research into development outcomes, additional investments to cutting edge research are necessary in a number of cross-cutting areas. Capacity development has been identified in the SRF as a strategic enabler of impact for both CGIAR and its partners. It goes far beyond the transfer of knowledge and skills through training, and cuts across multiple levels – individual, organizational and institutional.
A separate call for a Community of Practice for years 2017 - 2019 to prioritize and seek synergistic approaches to system-level capacity development is being sought. **Therefore, it is expected that individual full proposals should include a fully detailed capacity development plan that addresses the four major areas outlined below:**

(i) **CapDev role in impact pathway**

**Expectation:** CRPs are expected to outline the role that CapDev will play in the expected research for development activities, and its expected outputs and outcomes along the impact pathway.

**Explanation:** As CapDev is a strategic enabler of innovation along the impact pathway, it is important to consider how it can play this role in each of stages/activities along the impact pathway and contribute to the achievement of intended impact.

(ii) **Strategic CapDev actions**

**Expectation:** CRPs are required to demonstrate which of the elements of the CapDev Framework it will implement and how.

**Explanation:** CRPs should use the CGIAR CapDev Framework (link to document to be provided) for outlining and planning the capacity development activities which best suit the particular program and can be implemented along its impact pathway. CRPs should identify which of the elements of the CapDev Framework are most appropriate to implement, especially at Flagship level, while making sure there is aggregation and cohesion across the whole CRP for the CapDev elements and activities chosen.

(iii) **Indicators that track progress and contribution to CapDev Sub-IDOs**

**Expectation:** CRPs are expected to consult the CapDev Indicators (link to document to be provided) and map their CapDev activities into one of the composite indicators.

**Explanation:** As the CGIAR SRF includes a capacity development Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO) and four sub-IDOs, a set of robust indicators have been developed to help CRPs in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of CapDev interventions, and linking the sub-IDOs and the CapDev Framework, so as to provide CRPs with additional ways of mapping their planned CapDev activities, to track progress, assess efficiency and effectiveness of CapDev actions, and capture lessons learned for continuous improvement.

(iv) **Budget and resource allocation**

**Expectation:** CRPs are expected to budget for CapDev at both CRP and Flagship levels in the narrative and identify budgetary contributions to the Capacity Development IDO in the Performance Indicator Matrix.
Explanation: The CRP should demonstrate that budgets allocated for CapDev have a credible share of the total CRP budget\(^5\) (e.g. totaling around 10% although amounts may vary in individual Flagship budgets).

2.6 Monitoring and Evaluation framework; Results Based Management

The SRF describes the CGIAR approach to results-based management (RBM) that is to be fully implemented in the CRP2 Portfolio starting from 2017. It is RBM with a robust monitoring, learning and evaluation (ME&L) system to drive a CGIAR-wide performance-based culture that is focused on results in pursuit of delivering value for investment.

Moving towards RBM implementation is a transformative process where “existing” investment mechanisms, partnerships and output delivery approaches need rethinking and change, linked to demand and performance. Delivering research outputs is not sufficient if no clear links are made with results (research outcomes, development outcomes and impacts) and value (investments). The CRP RBM and ME&L Strategy outlines the anticipated processes involved in planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, reporting on results, and sharing knowledge produced.

As a principle of the 2\(^{nd}\) call, the Consortium expects that all CRPs (and their Lead Centers) will follow a harmonized and homogeneous monitoring and reporting framework.

Results-Based Management (RBM)

RBM is the proactive gathering of information on results and performance, and providing managers at different levels with the needed flexibility to be able to use that information to manage towards results, and to reallocate resources (budget, staff) in order to maximize results.

Each CRP must have in place a Results Framework that describes:

(i) the CRP’s overview Theory of Change (ToC), and
(ii) a more detailed ToC at the Flagship level.

A ToC describes and explains the causal linkages through which it is expected that an intervention will bring about the desired results. As such, a ToC includes the relevant impact pathways showing the sequence of actions from research activities/outputs to impact, as well as the assumptions and risks underlying the pathways.

At the CRP level, the ToC presents the identification of the ways by which change is expected to occur from research outputs, to research outcomes, to intermediate development outcomes (IDOs) and to system-level outcomes (SLOs) along an impact pathway, including

\(^5\) Indicatively, 10-20% of budget was nominally allocated to Capacity development in pre-proposals.
associated assumptions and risks. At the FP level, the **sub-ToC** explain how the CoAs fit in the described flagship and at what levels sub-IDOs are addressed, along with the embedded impact pathways and relevant assumptions and risks. As well, they would typically identify the enabling actions needed to be undertaken by partners to bring about the expected results. Sub-ToCs should avoid a “list approach”—just listing various results at different levels with no indication of the causal pathways between levels. It is recommended to keep ToC text and figures together (and not in an annex) to facilitate the reading/understanding of both text and figure in parallel. In addition, **nested ToC** could be proposed for specific actions (e.g. gender, capacity development), specific target groups or specific locations in some of the 20 selected country sites or any other targeted country.

The SRF is both guide and goal for each CRP, setting out high-level collective aspirational performance targets for the CGIAR SLOs. As part of its results strategy, each CRP, will set **performance targets (milestones)** over a multi-year timeline. Targets need to be set along the impact pathways related to the various levels of outcomes and indicate the expected timeframe involved. Indicators used to measure progress towards target should SMART indicators (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound), related to Sub-IDO and presented in the **Performance Indicator Matrix** (see below). Common indicators are being developed among CRPs for the same IDOs and sub-IDOs.

This results framework will be used to 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 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 Flagship (level n-1), and the Cluster of Activities (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.

The Performance Indicator Matrix will become the core element of the full proposal submission, as well as the core element for ongoing monitoring and reporting of progress. It will capture the CRPs and individual flagships proposed contributions to the qualitative Results Framework (RF) and to the quantitative 2022 CGIAR targets, and the allocated budget amounts by outcome. The corresponding list of research outputs and milestones over time and the detailed budgets that will lead to the successful completion of the outcomes are key supporting documents.

Each approved CRP will be requested to prepare its full proposal on the basis of an **indicative average annual core budget** (totaled over all funding sources, that is, W1, W2, W3 and Bilateral) for the Full Proposal, adding up to the low or conservative resource mobilization (RM) scenario that the CGIAR FC/ System Council is confident will be available. Only the W1
and W2 portion will be guaranteed. In addition, each CRP will also be awarded an *uplift budget*, corresponding to the additional resources that may become available in the medium and high RM scenarios.

It is important that we can distinguish the outcomes and results associated with the CRP core and uplift budgets: clearly a CRP will prioritize its activities differently in the face of the different levels of certainty of the funding.

We therefore expect CRP full proposals to submit two sets of performance indicator matrices: one adding up to the core budget, and, in a second matrix, the *additional* outcomes that will result from the uplift budget.

The Performance Matrix will require three types of result:

a. Qualitative outcomes directed at the Results Framework’s sub-IDOs in 2022  
b. Quantitative outcomes against the CGIAR targets in 2022  
c. Monitoring outcomes for the intermediate years

In order to have clarity on the metrics and allocation of resources, outcomes need to be designed so that they do not span multiple sub-IDOs. This will greatly improve the clarity of the results targeted, and help with the aggregation to the IDO and SLO levels. The performance matrix should have a row for each [sub-IDO x outcome] in order to help having a clear matrix at the CRP and portfolio level. In addition to contributions to the Results Framework and the CGIAR targets, the performance indicator matrix will also seek information about:

- outcomes where there is collaboration across CRPs (and potential co-funding)  
- outcomes with a scaling component in the CGIAR focus geographies, and corresponding funding allocations by country  
- outcomes that are funded with W1/W2 financial resources

After submission of the full proposals, the analysis of the performance indicator matrix will seek to answer five key questions:

1. What share of the 2022 interim CGIAR targets is a proposal aiming for?  
2. Are the outcome targets consistent across the summary narrative and the Performance Indicator Matrix? Are they reasonable and credible?  
3. Are outcomes budgets by Flagship and Outcome reasonable and credible?  
4. Will the portfolio deliver on the CGIAR Targets?  
5. Are there investment gaps in the portfolio?
A CRP Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Strategy

A CRP ME&L Strategy, describes how CRPs will measure and assess progress on an ongoing basis. The basic elements of an ME&L Strategy cover CRP strategies for monitoring and evaluating the results of CRP efforts, and learning how to improve CRP programs and Flagships based on that evidence-based information:

I. A CRP Monitoring Strategy, describing what results and performance data is to be collected by whom and when.

II. A Learning and Reporting Strategy, describing how CRPs will be using the performance information gathered from monitoring and evaluation to adapt and improve performance on an ongoing basis, and to report on progress and accomplishments.

III. A Rolling 5 year Evaluation Plan of CRP commissioned evaluations to complement CRP monitoring, providing more in-depth assessment of progress.

IV. An Impact Assessment Strategy, outlining how the program will assess impacts, and scale of impacts, arising from the work that the CRP conducts individually or jointly with others.

CRP Monitoring Strategy

Monitoring aims to provide (1) staff and managers within CRP evidence on which to base decisions on operational issues and for adaptively managing having a bi-annual reporting for research and finance, and (2) usually on an annual basis, CRP accountability to donors. The monitoring plan should set out how, when and by whom data will be collected and used on research outputs and research outcomes, including baselines, to assess progress towards outcomes and on the CRP contribution to sub-IDOs, IDOs and SLOs, along with a description of what procedures will be adopted to ensure the quality of the data gathered.

This includes agreeing joint accountabilities with partners, on who does what and when along the impact pathway, as well as who collects what data. The ME&L strategy describes the partners involved in the various theories of change and an understanding of each other’s role in achieving results, in particular responsibilities for monitoring progress. Different levels of collaboration could be defined from (i) standardized agreed methods for data collection or information sharing, technology exchange; (ii) Joint staff appointment and joint model development; and /or (iii) co-investment on twin Flagships or CoAs (common resources, common agenda, shared responsibilities for delivery) and clarity in reporting. This positioning will be strategic to implement the design of the proposed country/site integration in phase II. It is expected that an amount (1% or sometimes 2% depending on the evaluation needs) should be allocated to fund an M&E function, to support the CRP Director and inform the stakeholders. The amount should be identified in the narrative.
This monitoring plan also includes measures to **monitor key risks** in both major risks in the overall CRP program and risks to the realization of the assumptions underlying the various CRP FP ToCs that have the potential to undermine success of the CRP.

The set up and/or means of implementing an **analytics ICT platform for planning, monitoring progress, reporting and learning** on projects at the CRP, FP and CoA levels should be described. This web-based analytics platform should be designed in order to be interoperable at portfolio level considering the CRP Structure (Flagships and CoAs), the Annual Report Indicators and Partnership engagement to map leveraged funds. This tool should produce a standard POWB/AR and allow the CRP management committee to re-issue the POWB whenever a budget alteration is communicated. The system should also enable CRP leader & management/governing bodies to choose strategically when the budget has to be cut based on intermediate performance indicators. The interoperable structure should consider linkages to CGIAR, Donors and Partners tools (i.e. CG- Space for Open Access with related metadata and Centers’/Partners’ repositories) and with a place-based approach that will facilitate site integration plans in the 2nd phase of CRPs. The ICT analytics platform for ME&L will allow the operationalization of the projects planning in relation to impact pathways and target indicators, for reporting biannually or annually in alignment with operational guidelines. It is assumed that if budget allocation is monitored biannually, CRPs need to have the reporting every six months to take corrective measurement. The learning process will be implemented internally (CRP and CGIAR) and externally (Partners).

This ICT system-wide project management and reporting system could also address the need at the portfolio level to set up a **cross-talk between financial and scientific monitoring tools** with real-time access to data on financial expenditure (OCS or equivalent interoperable system with similar functionalities) and deliverables.

**CRP Learning and Reporting Strategy**

In line with continuous improvement of the framework, the **learning strategy** is a plan on how the CRP will learn from the information collected from ME&L, and report on accomplishments. The plan would include aspects such as:

- At least annually reviewing and revising the theories of change and their impact pathways as living and dynamic tools based on evidence collected, and to the extent possible, conducting contribution analysis to gage the contribution the CRP is making to outcomes
- Annually conducting reflection sessions on performance and risk information collected throughout the year
- Adjusting and prioritizing the implementation of the Program in line with the evidence collected
- Implementing and adjusting mitigation measures to manage risks
• Documenting lessons learned and best practices (e.g., meta-synthesis of lessons from evaluations)
• Conducting evaluation workshops to reflect on and adjust to the evaluation findings and lessons
• Knowledge management and information sharing
• Following up on learning decisions, including actions plans in response to evaluation recommendations

Innovation in approaches to learning is encouraged.

The **reporting strategy** also identifies what performance reports from the performance information—monitoring data and analysis—will be produced when and for whom. The strategy could indicate the general type of results information to be reported in each case. The results framework for the intervention provides a good basis on which to structure performance reporting.

There are usually:

- **Internal CRP reports**: Performance reports to inform CRP staff and management, as well as senior management. There could be monthly, quarterly and annual internal reports. These reports serve learning and internal accountability.

- **External performance reports**: The Annual CRP Performance Report or **CRP Annual Report** informs the Consortium Office and donors during the program life cycle. It has an accountability focus and aims to tell donors explicitly what aspects of the accountability system in the SRF would be reported. It provides a strategic overview of where the program stands for monitoring progress along the Impact Pathways (IP), Theory of Changes (ToC) and towards its targets. The CRP Annual Report focuses on outputs and outcomes and if relevant explains changes in future directions. It covers the results achieved, regardless of sources of funds used to produce the results.

In the first cycle of programs, a CRP was reporting annually on the following items: (A) key messages, (B) Impact pathway and intermediate development outcomes (IDOs), (C) Progress along the impact pathway with progress towards outputs (C1), progress towards the achievement of research outcomes and IDOs (C2), and progress towards impact (C3), (D) gender research achievements, (E) partnerships building achievements, (F) capacity building, (G) risk management (H) lessons learned and (I) CRP financial report. The content of this CRP reporting template was discussed and agreed by all the donors but necessary improvement and modification will be requested for the new CRP Annual Reports 2017 to 2022, for example with a specific section on sub-IDOs and their connection with research outcomes and IDOs.
The annual reporting indicators will be revised in accordance with the Phase experience in order to (i) measure yearly performance of CRPs and (ii) in accordance with the content of the Performance Indicator Matrix submitted in the full proposal.

**CRP Rolling Five-Year Evaluation Plan**

The rolling five-year evaluation plan will identify CRP Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs) at the Flagship Project level to be undertaken in a CRP cycle. The conduct of these CCEEs will be spread over the cycle to minimize the burden on management and researchers. The CCEEs will cover at least half of the budgeted activities in a cycle in line with the CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement’s Guidance for CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (January 2015). These evaluations will provide credible and useful information for accountability and learning purposes. They are considered the building blocks to the external evaluations conducted by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement. The evaluation plan will also outline other research or evaluation studies necessary to monitor progress as identified in the Performance and Risk Monitoring Plan.

A budget of US$ 300,000 per year will be identified in the narrative of the CRP allocation and against the Consultant line item for the conduct of these CCEEs. Joint CCEEs will be sought to leverage the resources of multiple CRPs and to assess performance within a geographic focus (likely in line with the site integration plans) or thematic area (e.g., seed systems, nutrition, and gender). A list of key [sector x country] could be defined and presented in this plan in order to clearly help CRPs to develop synergies. This plan will also outline other studies necessary to monitor progress as identified in the Performance and Risk Monitoring Plan.

These CCEEs will consist of a systematic and objective assessment of the program based on evaluation criteria related to relevance, efficiency, quality of science, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

**Impact Assessment Strategy**

CRPs should develop an impact assessment strategy and schedule impact assessments to demonstrate the effects that program outcomes have on higher level system impact targets.

There needs to be a regular and systematic effort to collect data on adoption and diffusion in such a way that:

a. uptake of CGIAR innovations can be tracked over time;
b. these innovations can, at least in principle, be linked to impact;
c. the tracking methods will give reliable and replicable information that can be validated; and
d. the information can or will be collected and/or transparently checked by non-CGIAR entities.
The means by which appropriate baselines for measurement have been established should be described and how relevant data will be stored should also be described in this section and cross-referenced to the Open Access report. For 2017 – 2022 this will include when a program is able to assess impacts of legacy work and delivery of outputs from a previous pipeline of research, or should assess the impacts arising from the work of others to refine claims for impact in the CRP’s own results framework. In both cases, sufficient budget should be identified in the CRP narrative to fulfil the impact strategy. Without a system in place, it is not possible to provide useful information on the continuing contributions of the CGIAR to the SLOs or to SDG targets and this capacity will affect the scoring of the proposal.

2.7 Intellectual asset management

An important criterion for the evaluation of CRP Full Proposals is the management of intellectual assets within the CRP. Indeed, the ability to effectively disseminate CRP research outputs and maximize impact depends on the proper management of intellectual assets at every stage of the life cycle of the CRP.

CRP participants are expected to manage intellectual assets in line with the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets (CGIAR IA Principles)\(^6\) and their Implementation Guidelines\(^7\). The notions of “intellectual assets” and IP rights will be covered by additional explanatory information in the submission tool.

The CGIAR IA Principles are complemented by the CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy, which became effective in 2013, and which deals specifically with the dissemination of information products on an open access basis within specified timeframes. CRP level strategy to implement Open Access is dealt with separately in section 2.8 of this Guidance.

**Reporting on IA management in the CRP full proposals**

CRP Full Proposals must contain a CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan which consists the following elements:

(i) **Overview**\(^8\) of intellectual assets management in the CRP

a. Complete the *CRP Outline for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs* in Exhibit A to this CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan.

---

\(^6\) The CGIAR IA Principles were approved by the Consortium Board and the Fund Council and became effective on 7 March 2012. As they are part of the Common Operational Framework, they apply to all funding and implementation aspects of the Strategy and Results Framework, including CRPs, regardless of funding source or implementing entity.

\(^7\) The Implementation Guidelines for the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets were approved by the Consortium Board and became effective on 14 June 2013.

\(^8\) The overview will be a narrative plus annex and, similarly, responses to other sections will generally require one page descriptions or responses guided by model templates (as per Annex 2 to this document).
b. Explain the relevance of intellectual asset management in the implementation of the CRP and how this will help achieve the objectives of the CRP, including regarding partnerships and scale-up for impact.

c. Describe the results of any state-of-the-art assessments or freedom to operate assessments which are of significance to the design or implementation of the CRP.

d. Provide an overview of types of intellectual assets which are to be developed as CRP outputs and their dissemination pathways (including further development if relevant) in the context of the particulars of the CRP. Referring explicitly to the Exhibit A CRP Outline for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs identify activities within Clusters of Activities involving CRP outputs and dissemination strategies for maximizing global accessibility and impact which highlight the following, as applicable:

- key dissemination pathways for managing intellectual assets as international public goods and other means of achieving prompt and broad dissemination (if any);
- key dissemination pathways dependent on securing rights to access and use restricted third-party technologies which are critical for the CRP (if any);
- key dissemination pathways anticipated to involve strategic management of intellectual assets via arrangements involving exclusivity, patents or plant variety protection (if any);
- key dissemination pathways anticipated to involve strategic management of intellectual assets involving innovative models (e.g. multi-stakeholder platforms) and/or including involvement with private sector (if any).

(II) Planning for intellectual assets management in the CRP lifecycle

Describe how CRP partners plan to implement effective intellectual assets management throughout the CRP lifecycle, including:

a. How you plan to identify anticipated CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination pathways during project planning (include in this regard your proposed Project Plan Template for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs as Exhibit B to this Intellectual Asset Management Plan)

b. How you plan to track actual CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination pathways during project implementation.

(iii) Decision-making structures relating to intellectual assets management at CRP level

a. Identify how decision making concerning intellectual asset management will occur at CRP level.
b. Identify any policies, guidelines (or key issues to be addressed by policies or guidelines) which are anticipated to be developed at CRP level in order to facilitate intellectual asset management by CRP partners (if any).  

9 This is not intended to include Open Access as this is dealt with in section [2.8] of the CRP Full Proposal Template

c. Identify issues related to intellectual asset management in respect of which the Lead Center or a partner CGIAR Center will retain decision making authority (e.g. re approval of Limited Exclusivity Arrangements, Restricted Use Agreements, and patents or plant variety protection applications arising pursuant to CRP implementation).

(iv) CRP capacity for intellectual assets management

Explain the capacity within the CRP to enable effective intellectual asset management and implementation of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan.

(v) CRP budget for intellectual assets management

a. Explain key resources, initiatives and activities associated with intellectual asset management which are budgeted for in the implementation of the CRP.

The IA budget table should be completed and indication provided as to how the IA management budget (illustrative Annex 2) is accommodated in the overall CRP budget.

2.8 Open Access and Open Data

Historically CGIAR Center data repositories have been managed separately so that contents are not generally easily discoverable or inter-linked where appropriate and useful (e.g., agronomic trial data with socioeconomic or adoption data in the same geography). In the absence of such interoperability-mediated discovery, data is of very limited utility. The overall objective, then, is to open CGIAR’s trove of research data and associated information for indexing and interlinking by a robust, demand-driven cyberinfrastructure for agriculture, ensuring that research outputs are open via FAIR principles – that is, they are Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Re-usable to enhance innovation, impact, and uptake.

Accordingly, CRP full proposals will need to explain, in the context of the Flagships and CoAs of the CRP their Open Access and Open Data (OA/OD) management strategies for achieving this objective, in keeping with efforts initiated across Centers and CRPs with knowledge, data, information, and legal specialists, as well as researchers, and administrators.

CRPs are expected to implement OA/OD strategies in line with the CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy (OADM Policy) which became effective in 2013 across all Centers, and its Implementation Guidelines which became effective in 2014. Several key donors also have OA/OD policies (e.g., the Bill and Melinda Gates Open Access Policy; USAID’s policy on...
Development Data}; they are currently working towards a common requirement (which is likely to be adherence to the CGIAR OADM Policy).

To ease operationalization, each Center’s knowledge, information and data managers, and in some instances legal staff and researchers have been working on finalizing an OA/OD implementation plan using a template developed by the Consortium Office OA/OD team. These documents should be carefully reviewed.

The CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy complements the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets which became effective in 2012 and deals more generally with the dissemination of intellectual assets for maximizing global accessibility and impact. CRP level strategy related more broadly to intellectual asset management is dealt with separately in section 2.7 of this Guidance.

Requirements for reporting on OA/OD in CRP full proposals

Effective OA/OD requires a proactive approach at every stage of both, the data management and the CRP life cycles. The OA/OD section of the CRP full proposals will be required to include the following key elements:

(i) Overview of OA/OD across the CRP in accordance with the CGIAR OADM Policy and FAIR principles, and why it will help achieve the objectives of the CRP.\(^\text{10}\)

(ii) A Data Management Plan (DMP), which is anticipated to be developed at the individual project, CoA, or Flagship Project level (depending on how different data management needs may be for each CRP), and included as an annex.

(iii) Current and/or potential needs, and the human resources available of planned for effective implementation of OA/OD across the CRP.

(iv) Governance arrangements relating to OA/OD in the CRP, including person/s accountable and reporting relationships.

(v) Current and planned technical infrastructure and associated interoperability standards and protocols, addressing repository platforms, interoperability standards (metadata schemas; vocabularies, ontologies etc.) and protocols (OAI-PMH; SPARQL etc.)

(vi) Working with CGIAR staff and partners to assure their support for and ability to OA/OD compliance, including anticipated training and advocacy needs, special OA/OD-related partnership agreements etc.

\(^\text{10}\) Typically narrative will be 1-2 pages with items (ii), (v) and (vi) having additional annexes.
(vii) **Budget for OA/OD implementation across the CRP**, along with a short justification for line items.

**CRP full proposal evaluation criteria for OA/OD**

The OA/OD component of CRP proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

a. Provides a clear overview of OA/OD which instils confidence that CRP outputs generated by Center and partner entities will be open as per the terms of the CGIAR OADM Policy and FAIR principles;

b. Includes indicative DMP (can be partially complete), with at least those elements identified at the CoA level;

c. Provides evidence of sufficient human resources to operationalize OA/OD across the CRP;

d. Demonstrates an effective OA/OD governance and accountability structure;

e. Includes evidence of a robust technical infrastructure for OA/OD via FAIR principles;

f. Shows that partners will be engaged from the start with respect to OA/OD, and their needs and support with respect to OA/OD via FAIR principles are or will be dealt with;

g. The budget narrative identifies that sufficient resources have been allocated to ensure effective OA/OD.

**2.9 Communication**

Communication is a critical success factor for the CRPs to deliver their development impact and for CGIAR to achieve the outcomes articulated in the SRF. Communication contributes in two ways. First, by contributing to the achievement of CRP outcomes at different scales. Second, by sharing program results to enhance visibility and demonstrate accountability.

CRPs should include a combination of the following six elements as a communications strategy:

1. Engaging in policy dialogue to scale up results

2. Engaging with actors on the ground to scale out technologies and practices

3. Communicating about the program, the science and results throughout the CRP lifecycle

4. Communicating and engaging with partners for effective development impact [this will need to connect to the Partnerships section]
5. Promoting learning and sharing of information to improve communications and collaboration within and across CRPs

6. Making CRP information and resources open and accessible

Communication activities also help enable and enhance, gender, capacity development, and monitoring and evaluation activities, at all stages of the CRP impact pathway.

(i) Dimensions of communication

In the full proposal CRPs should outline two dimensions of communications. First, at the flagship level, the proposal should include an overview of the communications tools and approaches to effectively engage with stakeholders to achieve development outcomes. Second, for the CRP as a whole, a plan should be developed to raise visibility and demonstrate accountability. The CRP should also clearly indicate how communications will be delivered between the CRP, lead Center and partners.

CRPs must allocate sufficient resources (identified in the narrative) to deliver the communications activities listed in the proposal, with appropriate budgeting at the CRP, Flagship and project levels. The key budget considerations are dedicated staff, product development (publications, websites, etc.), events, engagement activities and information management.

(ii) Criteria and Template

Criterion for Communications at the CRP level

Evidence that communications are integrated to ensure the delivery of research and development impact of the program, with a clear link to the program’s theory of change.

Criterion for communications at the Flagship level

Evidence that an appropriate mix of tools and approaches drawn from the 6 suggested key areas of intervention (see box) will be put in place to ensure continuous communications and knowledge sharing amongst all flagship partners and stakeholders.

CRP proposal Template

CRP narrative - Detail the approach to communications and knowledge sharing amongst partners and stakeholders.

Flagship level narrative - Outline a plan for how an appropriate mix of communications and knowledge-sharing tools and approaches drawn from the six suggested key areas of intervention will be put in place.
2.10 Governance and Management

A critical learning opportunity from the first round of CRPs is to ensure that all strategic partners have access to an equitable share of the budget based on their agreed contribution and ability to deliver outcomes cost-effectively. Selection of a Lead Center (to be agreed by the CGIAR Centers) should be based on science leadership, expertise and managerial capacity.

Lead Centers should be members of the CGIAR Consortium in order to continue to draw on and build the strengths of the system, in line with the original design of the reforms: to make sure the ‘whole efforts of the Centers are greater than the sum of their parts’. To fulfil this role Lead Centers should have a high degree of coherence and alignment with the CRP; strong engagement with the CRP; established scientific expertise and reputation; and high recognition and convening power. Most importantly the Lead Center should have the capacity to deliver against the SRF and its planned outcomes. In addition to the science leadership and expertise of the Lead Center, science and development partnerships and networks will also play an important role in the success of the CRPs.

Proposals are required to outline the proposed CRP governance and management arrangements in a manner consistent with the Consortium’s Response to the IEA Review of CRP Governance and management\(^\text{11}\). Additionally, CRP proposals will need to identify an Independent Steering Committee, a CRP Leader and a CRP Management Committee. Figure 2 illustrates the overall reporting structure that each CRP should implement.

\textbf{Figure 2. CRP governance and reporting structure}

\[\text{Figure 2. CRP governance and reporting structure}\]

\(^{11}\) [weblink to be provided]
While CRPs should be led by CGIAR Centers, non-CGIAR institutions may lead Flagships within CRPs, depending on their comparative advantages and track record. A Lead Center should not lead most of the Flagships within a given CRP.

Flagship leading partners, whether CGIAR or non-CGIAR, should appoint a senior researcher as Flagship Leader (and Principal Investigator) and have dedicated senior research staff with strong publications and/or development impact track record; ability to deliver against relevant development outcomes; a commitment to raise bilateral or W3 funds to complement W1 and W2 funds; and ability to lead complex multi-partner projects including ability to attract strong partners.

All Lead Centers and Flagship leaders should comply with the Consortium’s reporting, financial and legal guidelines, including information systems for open data and information exchange; and mechanism for evaluating research quality and ethical reviews. An important role for Lead Centers is the role of a convener with an open and horizontal culture, which readily enables partnerships to flourish. Ensuring even-handedness, transparency and accountability should be of top consideration. It will be important that CRP leaders can demonstrate ability to provide management (including adequate and near real time budget management) of the CRP which is likely to be an on-site assessment criterion.

Participating Centers should have:

- Dedicated senior research staff charged with leading the Center’s activities with the CRP.
- Critical mass of senior research staff with strong track record.
- Proven leadership of multi-partner projects and ability to attract strong partners.
- Proven ability to deliver high-quality reports – linked to CRP outcomes.
- Information systems for open data and information exchange.
- Mechanism for research quality, gender mainstreaming and ethical reviews, particularly with respect to personal data, animal research and genetic and biological risks.

Lead Centers and their strategic partners in a CRP should agree on a joint resource mobilization strategy, with practical guidelines for CRP- and Center-led fundraising, for the CRP prior to submitting the full proposal.

Proposals are expected to indicate which CGIAR Center and other partners are strategic partners (tier 1 partners). Not all CGIAR Centers participating in a CRP need to be strategic partners; particularly for those CRPs in which many or most centers participate. Selectively identifying Centers as strategic partners will reduce transaction costs. Strategic partners should include at least the Lead Center and all partners who lead a Flagship. Strategic partners should have institutional representation in the CRP’s governance (either a seat on the Independent Steering Committee, or representation through another partner if a CRP has too many strategic partners). Strategic partners will also be represented on the CRP management team through their CRP
director, a Flagship leader, or a Principal Investigator (for strategic partners that do not lead a Flagship). Each CRP is likely to have a very large number of other partners (tier 2 partners) that need not be involved in governance and management as are the strategic partners. Tier 2 partners may also have a much more simplified contracting and reporting requirements.

### 2.11 Budget, Financial management and reporting

The evaluation of CRP full proposals will include an evaluation of the financial resources requested by each flagship in conjunction with the results each flagship plans to achieve.

The proposal documents – including the narrative, budget template, budget narrative, and performance indicator matrix are expected to provide consistent information that will support the value for money analysis of the portfolio.

The budget review will typically seek to answer the following key questions:

1. Is the proposed mix, level, and timing of spend appropriate for the proposed activities and outcomes? Are the assumptions behind major cost drivers reasonable? (E.g. input quantities, input unit costs, inflation, etc.)

2. Are the target outcomes reliant on multiple sources of funding (W1, W2, W3 and/or bilateral) and, if so, what are the sources, certainty, and terms of that funding?

3. What are the 3-5 major risks to the CRP executing against the budget as planned?

4. What is an appropriate payment schedule for the investment, given realistic speed of implementation and key milestones?

5. Does the budget comply with CGIAR policies and standard practice for this type of investment?

As described in the RBM section of this guidance, the reporting framework will focus not only on financial aspects, but also on the progress against the outcome targets for each flagship so that CRPs can actively manage their flagships, and implement adjustments to the initial plan and budget as needed. Ideally, the CRP payment schedule would be tied to intermediate results, to be reported periodically, in order to manage the financial exposure of the portfolio based on the level of uncertainty to achieve the outcomes.

What follows is a proposed approach\textsuperscript{12} to ensure that the Consortium Office can receive adequate financial information from the CRPs as they submit their final proposal.

\textsuperscript{12} Full guidelines will be revised during the month of October and beginning of November.
The key design principle of the budgeting framework and tool is “right-size rigor”: that is, striking the right balance between the level of detail we request, and the information we need for decision-making.

Another key principle is “flexibility”: while we need some standards on how the financial information is delivered to us, we also acknowledge that CRPs need some flexibility in how they structure their budgets given the different context in which they operate. The current plan is to design a budget tool to capture only information relevant to the Consortium Office reviewers regarding how financial resources are used. In other words, the tool will be designed to capture less details in some areas than others (see further below). This means that we do not expect CRPs to prepare their full detailed budgets in this tool.

**What budgets and how many per CRP will need to be submitted?**

A budget will be comprised of two documents: an excel spreadsheet with detailed quantitative information and a narrative that will provide additional context and explanation regarding the figures and the connection between the budget and the scope of the activities funded under that budget.

Each CRP is comprised of multiple flagship projects. Given the material size of these flagships, we expect CRPs to submit individual budgets for each Flagship over the 2017 – 2022 period.

In addition, each approved CRP will be requested to prepare its full proposal on the basis of an *indicative average annual core budget* (totaled over all funding sources, that is, W1, W2, W3 and Bilateral) for the Full Proposal, adding up to the low or conservative RM scenario that the CGIAR FC/ System Council is confident will be available. Only the W1 and W2 portion will be guaranteed. In addition, each CRP will also be awarded an *uplift budget*, corresponding to the additional resources that may become available in the medium and high RM scenarios.

We expect CRP full proposals to submit:

**Two sets of detailed budgets by Flagship:** one set that adds up to the approved core budget and one that adds up to the approved uplift budget.

**Information and level of budget detail:** Each budget will provide information on the uses of funds by standard accounting categories/ natural classification:

- Personnel and benefits: a detailed list of individuals assigned to the flagship project, along with a description of their role and responsibilities, wage compensation and all related expenses (benefits).
- Travel: a detailed list of all the trips planned, along with a description of the purpose of the trips, cost per trips and number of trips.
Consultants: a detailed list of all the individuals working on the flagship projects, but are not substantive employees, along with a description of their engagement, billing rate, number of billable days / hours and expenses.

Capital equipment: a detailed list of items with a value of at least US$5,000 and a useful life of more than one year.

Other direct costs: a detailed list of items including supplies and equipment, or any other costs that are not management and support costs and that don’t fit in any of the categories above.

Sub-awards: contracts or CRPs that the Lead Center will negotiate with other CGIAR Centers or third-party organizations who directly contribute to the scope of the CRP.

CRP Management and support cost: generally considered indirect costs. A more precise definition will be provided.

In view of the fiduciary responsibility vested in the Consortium Board through the Joint Agreement, more detailed budget information is required for Window 1 and Window 2 funding than it is for Window 3 and bilateral funding.

The budget tool will allow CRPs to provide different levels of detail for costs depending on how they will be funded:

- at the detailed, line item level (unit cost and number of units), by year, for costs funded by W1-W2,
- at the category level only, by year, for costs funded by W3-Bilateral.

While we expect that the budgeting will be done at the level of the activities and/or cluster of activities, we will not require that the budget information be submitted at that level, for either category of funding. Similarly, while we expect that CRPs will develop a detailed mapping of how financial resources will be spend in different countries where the work is being performed, we will not require that the detailed budget by country be submitted, only the totals by country, by year.

CRPs will be asked to provide high level breakdown (not line item details) of the budget for:

- outcomes (in the performance indicator matrix)
- countries where beneficiaries are located (in the performance indicator matrix)
- gender-responsive outcomes (in the performance indicator matrix)
- capacity development (in the performance indicator matrix)
- impact assessment (in the budget narrative)
- intellectual asset management (in the budget narrative)
- open access and data management (in the budget narrative)
- communication (in the budget narrative)
Financial reporting

The financial reporting tool is included in the budgeting tool and it can be updated during each review cycle. At the end of a cycle, the CRP will collect actual expenditures by accounting categories and report these numbers in the budget tool. This will allow the reviewers to conduct variance analysis. The CRP will also provide a reforecast of expenditures for future years to reflect in the financial numbers any changes to the project plan going forward.

2.12 Requirements for [coordinating platforms] [Community of Practice]

[No text is provided for this item. If any coordinating platform is retained or specified following the decision of the Fund Council, this section will be elaborated accordingly.]
3. Proposal review and Approval Process

In accordance with the process and timetable set out in table 1, table 5 sets out the key actors in the pre-proposal review and approval process.

Table 5: Key actors in the pre-proposal review and approval process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>1. Submission of CRP proposals (invited Lead Centers), together with any Platforms (invited Center) to take on coordination of one or more of the four cross-cutting platforms. Deadline of 31 March 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPC</td>
<td>2. External independent technical review of the proposals against the criteria set out in section 5 (and, as may be amended in November 2015 review) 3. Will rate the proposals as worthy or not of funding and provide review comments. 4. Rating and review comments provided to the Fund Council/System Council for decisions on selection and funding for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Office in consultation with the Fund Office</td>
<td>1. Concurrent with the ISPC independent peer review, consideration of management/operational aspects of the proposals and the cross-cutting platforms as a contribution to decision making at the Fund Council/System Council level. 2. Preparation of deliberative papers for the Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee (SPPC) of the Consortium Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPPC</td>
<td>3. Consideration of collated data from the ISPC review and Consortium Office/Fund Office consideration of management/operational aspects, to inform the SPPC’s governance-level recommendation to the Consortium Board on the package to take forward to the Fund Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Board</td>
<td>4. Review SPPC recommendations on the package of proposals and recommended actions (as relevant) for both CRP fundable and other elements together with the recommended financial allocation for supported CRPs (as an indicative budget envelope but not the final approved budget allocation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Council</td>
<td>5. Consideration of data from both the ISPC external independent technical peer review, [and the Consortium Board/System Office recommendation to make a final decision on the pre-proposals. 6. Approves the budget for approved proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISPC categorization of proposals

ISPC has been requested by the Fund Council to assess research priorities and the Consortium Office will analyze value for money of the proposals submitted to implement the SRF generally and reach the CGIAR targets specifically.

Both will be based on the submitted proposals, plus all additional material available such as CRP annual reports, evaluations and audits.
Proposals for CRPs and platforms submitted for ISPC external independent peer review may be rated for inclusion or exclusion by the ISPC with an explanatory commentary.

**Priority Setting, Value for Money and Budget Allocation**

The Consortium/System Office will comment on value for money or implementation issues and will recommend what they consider the best option for advancing the proposal or platform and make recommendations accordingly to the Fund Council for decision.

The ISPC review and recommendations, together with the Consortium Office/System Office’s analysis, will inform recommendations for financial allocations to each approved CRP as indicative budgets. The Fund Council will set the overall budget envelope and W1/W2 ceiling (see Chapter 6).

All CRP full proposals are requested to make the case for their contribution to implementation of the SRF in terms of the results they propose to deliver and the budgeted costs of each of those results at Flagship level for all CGIAR Fund windows and bilateral sources combined. Budgeted costs must be total costs, inclusive of overheads, management costs, partnership costs and all costs with a special designation such as for gender research, capacity development or co-investment.

The Fund Council will provide guidance for the maximum budget each CRP can submit at the full proposal stage to ensure that the total of submitted Full Proposals will be within the scenarios of available resources. Scenarios for available resources are developed in parallel through the Resource Mobilization Strategy. The Consortium Board may also recommend, and the Fund Council may decide, on further guidance on CGIAR Fund window shares in line with the CGIAR Resource Mobilization Strategy to be approved at the Fund Council’s November 2015 meeting.

Should the ISPC’s external independent peer review of the submitted portfolio conclude that there are gaps in the coverage of the research agenda laid out in the SRF, then the ISPC and the Consortium may recommend, and the Fund Council may decide, to call for the development of additional proposals from CGIAR Centers and their partners, or alternative providers, commensurate with strong indications of additional funding for the specific activity.
3. **Criteria for Assessing Full Proposals**

The following criteria will be used to review proposals. There is no formal weighting applicable to the criteria, and each criterion must be adequately addressed.

### 3.1 Criteria at CRP level

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

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

2. The rigor and credibility of the scientific arguments underpinning the rationale for the proposal, including the cohesion of the Flagships.

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

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

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

6. Recognition of the importance of the enabling environment.

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

**Budget**

8. 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*.

**Cohesion**

9. Is there a convincing *integration of activities* between relevant Agri-Food programs with Global Integrating programs to address CGIAR goals in a value added manner?

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

11. Is there evidence that the CRP as a whole will make a *significant contribution to delivery* at the CGIAR system level?
12. 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?

**Governance and management**

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

14. Are the **governance arrangements** proposed in line with the CRP Governance and Management responsibilities?

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

16. 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?

### 3.2 Criteria at Flagship level

17. **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)

18. Recognition of the need for the research to account for **potential unintended consequences** on SLOS that are not the primary focus of the research. For instance, a particular concern is attention to **food loss** and **post-harvest waste**.

19. 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.

20. **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.

21. The plausibility of the **Theory of Change** and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDOs and IDOs and the feasibility of the **Impact Pathways**.
22. Significance of expected contribution to SRF gender IDOs

23. 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?

24. 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?

4. Proposal template

[A proposal template for on-line submissions is being designed and will be available by the end of February, in advance of the time of the proposal submission.]

5. Allocation of budgets to CRPs in phase II

The two key lessons learned from the first round of CRPs are:

- Donors have lost confidence that Windows 1 and 2 provide a good return on their investment, and the share of W1-2 is dropping precipitously in 2014-15 to below 20%, while Centers state that the optimal share of W1-2 is 40-50%. Re-gaining donor confidence in W1-2 is critical.

- Centers experienced the uncertainty, fluctuations and late disbursements, both year-to-year and within year corrections, of W1-2 allocations as a major drawback, if not the major drawback of the reformed system. Establishing stable, reliable and regular W1-2 allocations, disbursed in a timely manner is also critical.

In addition there are contributing issues, some of the most important are listed hereafter:

- Ambiguity in the role of Window 2 funding that is formally fully fungible with Window 1 (as per the contracts and agreements), but that in practice requires at least partial additionality (more money for a CRP as a result of a W2 allocation) to be effective for W2 donors and recipients.

- Lack of clear mapping of bilateral projects to CRPs, uncertainty whether bilateral projects are focused on the same goal as the approved CRPs, combined with co-funding of bilateral projects from W1-2 funding, leads to disagreements among donors on the value of W3 and bilateral projects.

- The reformed system does not address the need of centers to recover true, full overhead, the need to invest in research infrastructure, or the need to maintain and add to reserves. Long term system health requires solutions for these issues.
This Guidance does not address the latter issue of overhead, reserves and infrastructure investment needs (these will have to be dealt with through the new System Council) but does address the other issues mentioned above through revised CRP funding mechanisms.

The four key element of the solution to address the issues identified as embedded in this Guidance are:

1. **Strategic use of W1-2.** Focusing the large majority of scarce W1-2 funding on the most strategic components of the research agenda (to be defined, but likely particularly to cover the upstream, discovery and high risk type research) and associating outcomes with the W1-2 funding. This should be the cornerstone of re-establishing confidence of the donors in shared investments in a core strategic research agenda through Windows 1 and 2.

2. **Limited co-funding of CRP W3-bilateral.** In addition, to legitimize some limited co-funding of W3-bilateral projects from W1-2, the W3-bilateral project Portfolio needs to be split into CRP and Center projects. CRP W3-bilateral projects need to be identified before their implementation starts, implement clearly identified parts of approved CRPs, and are managed, reported and evaluated as part of the CRP. Only for these CRP W3-bilateral projects is (limited) co-funding from W1-2 legitimate and allowed. The corollary is that Center bilateral projects have their value, and are legitimate, but are not managed or reported as part of CRPs – and cannot be co-funded through W1-2 funds.

3. **Scaling up and out primarily funded from W3-bilateral.** Scaling up and out to reach millions of beneficiaries through integrated delivery type project is an important function of the CGIAR and can pose legitimate research questions. Recognizing that W3 and bilateral funding is particularly available for these purposes, scaling up and out should primarily be funded from W3-bilateral, with only limited W1-2 co-funding.

4. **Safe core and aspirational uplift budgets.** Core budgets (of both W1-2 and W3-bilateral) correspond with a conservative resource mobilization scenario, of which part is held back (un-allocated) to enable Centers and CRPs to plan to spend these core budgets as safe, reliable minimum budgets that will be disbursed in a timely manner. At the same time, uplift budgets are identified that are associated with an agreed ambitious resource mobilization scenario. Outcomes need to be identified for both core and uplift budgets (split by W1-2 and W3-bilateral), to enable both accountability for the core budget outcomes, as well as targeted resource mobilization to achieve the uplift budgets.
Annex 1: Reporting on Gender (Glossary)

DEFINITION OF GENDER RESEARCH FOR CRP GENDER BUDGETS

Background

The CGIAR Gender Scoping Study (2010) used the following definitions that have been incorporated into each CRP Gender Strategy:

Gender analysis is a systematic process of using quantitative and qualitative methods to identify differences in the needs, roles, statuses, priorities, capacities, constraints and opportunities of women and men. Gender analysis is used in both the following types of research:

Integrated (applied) gender research: integrates consideration of gender into technical research which is the principal topic of study, for example, plant breeding, aquaculture, postharvest technology development, systems intensification.

EXAMPLE

• Cataloguing, understanding and, where appropriate, building on existing pest and disease knowledge of local male and female farmers
• A gender audit of systems and regions where pests and diseases of global importance are prevalent.

Source: RTB Gender Strategy

Strategic gender research: studies gender as the primary topic in a social analysis designed to understand what the implications of gender are for agriculture. E.g. how men and women allocate labor resources in intra-household decision-making about farm production

EXAMPLE:

Our approach to strategic gender research is to develop a set of over-arching research questions of systematic importance for strengthening equity and efficiency in the research efforts of the RTB program. We have identified six target sites across the major regions where there is a convergence of factors for the establishment of case study research for testing the research questions. E.g. Implications of intra-household resource use and decision-making for equity and innovation in different RTB crop constellations

Source: RTB Gender Strategy

DEFINITION: STRATEGIC GENDER RESEARCH

The cost of strategic gender research corresponds to 100 % of the total cost because gender is the primary focus of the study (or cluster of activities)
1.1 **Diagnostic gender analysis**: the primary objective of the research is to understand gender roles and relations between men and women (i.e. differences in their needs, statuses, roles, capacities, constraints) and interpret the significance of these differences for agriculture or natural resource management.

**EXAMPLE**

*Gender implications of agro-industrialization.* The transformation of artisanal production and postharvest processing of cassava to an industrial scale has critical poverty and gender implications.

*Source: RTB Gender Strategy*

1.2. **Ex ante or ex post gender impact studies**: the primary objective of the research is to predict or evaluate how gender relations among different types of male and female beneficiary groups (e.g. laborers, producers, traders, urban consumers) affect access, adoption and its outcomes.

1.3. **Development of innovations that explicitly target women and men differently**: the primary objective of the research is to develop innovations tailored to address the different assets, resources and capabilities of men and women beneficiaries, using gender analysis. This research must use gender analysis to design, develop and scale out technology, practices, institutional or policy outputs that explicitly target women differently from men, based on a sound diagnostic study that shows this approach is required for impact.

**EXAMPLES**

- Studies that engage with men and women separately, collecting information separately from men and women respondent to understand gender e.g. Tools for overcoming barriers to women’s participation in multilevel forest governance mechanisms.

- Field experiments, technology trials, participatory technology evaluations (includes PVS) to develop technologies that explicitly target women throughout, to discern whether and how technology design, development and scaling out needs to be done differently for women compared with men e.g. earlier, faster-cooking varieties; light-weight tools or machinery; forage for small livestock rearing by women; targeting female members of landless households in Bangladesh with improved food-fish trading and male members of landless households with improved pond netting.

- Research to develop policy recommendations, market development strategies or designs for institutional arrangements with a principal focus on identifying whether and how different mechanisms are needed in order for women to benefit as well as men: e.g. the
kinds of assets poor men and women hold, how they acquire them, and how to help individuals build up and protect their stocks.

1.4 Not strategic gender research

Research that only uses sex-disaggregated data to describe potential beneficiaries or end-users of an output but that does not use gender analysis to design or develop the main outputs cannot be classified as strategic gender research.

DEFINITION: INTEGRATED GENDER RESEARCH

The cost of gender research corresponds to less than 100 percent of the cost of the study (or cluster of activities) because gender analysis is not the primary objective of the research.

2. 1. Agricultural studies, field experiments, technology trials, participatory technology evaluations (includes PVS), demonstrations of innovations or development interventions that generate descriptive sex-disaggregated information. The cost charged to the gender budget of these types of studies should not exceed 30 percent of the total cost.

EXAMPLE
Varietal selection based on men and women’s choices
Promotion of the use of improved banana hybrids and popular local varieties across regions by involving men and women farmers groups in the selection process.
Catalogue of sex-disaggregated preferences for traits
The development of biofortified foods taking into account the unique nutrient needs of women and girls
Sources: RTB, A4NH Gender Strategies

2.2. Ex ante or ex post impact studies that do not have the analysis of differences between male and female adults or children (i.e. in their needs, statuses, roles, capacities, constraints) as a primary objective, but that obtain, analyze, report or publish sex-disaggregated socio-economic data on differences between men and women in access, adoption or impact

The cost charged to the gender budget of these types of studies should not exceed 30 percent of the total cost.

EXAMPLES
Studies of impact on women of extended shelf-life in different markets
Household surveys of acceptability of herbicide tolerant cassava
Analysis of expected impact of herbicide-tolerant cassava on women's livelihoods and health
2.3. Studies that **do not** have as a primary objective the analysis of gender relations but that include the collection, analysis, reporting or publication of socio-economic information obtained from both male and female respondents.

The cost charged to the gender budget of these types of studies should not exceed **50 percent** of the total cost.

**EXAMPLES**
- Sex-disaggregated databases on indigenous and on conservation practices.
- Gendered national and regional on-farm conservation strategies.
- Involvement of women as multipliers and disseminators of planting material of new varieties.
- Catalogue of sex-disaggregated preferences for traits.
- Sex-disaggregated databases on consumer acceptance of yellow cassava.
- Data on gender and life-cycle differences in nutrition and health burdens.
- Gender differences in preferences for forest species and management strategies.

*Sources: RTB, A4NH, FTA Gender Strategy*

3. **Not gender research**

3.1 Research that involves men and women as participants in field trials or field schools, as key informants, focus group members or survey respondents but does not aim to analyze or interpret gender differences.

3.2 Research that does not conform to recommended standards for collecting sex-disaggregated data (specific standards are due to be provided by PIM and the CGIAR Gender Research Network).

3.3 Research that does not collect sex-disaggregated data.

3.4 Research that involves female staff but that has no relation to any of the activities listed above as *bona fide* gender research.

4. **Gender Analysis Capacity Development or Training**

4.1 Strategic: Events that are 100% dedicated to awareness building or skill building for the application of gender analysis or interpretation and use of its findings. The *charge to gender budget in this type of training corresponds to 100 percent of the course.*

4.2 Integrated: Events that have a different purpose but that include some awareness building or skill building for the application of gender analysis or interpretation and use...
of its findings. **The charge to gender budget in this type of training should correspond to the actual proportion of the time in the course devoted to gender analysis.**

4.3 **Not included:** Events that include female participants or are exclusively for female participants and have no content related to gender analysis are not chargeable to the gender budget.
Annex 2: CRP Full Proposal Template for intellectual asset management

1. CRP full proposal template

Effective management of intellectual assets requires a proactive approach at every stage of the CRP life cycle irrespective of the dissemination model employed to achieve impact. CRP full proposals are required to include a CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan addressing the following key elements as contained in the CRP Full Proposal Template:

- overview of intellectual assets management in the CRP
- decision making structures relating to intellectual assets management in the CRP (e.g. governance, policies)
- capacity for intellectual assets management in the CRP
- planning for intellectual assets management in the CRP lifecycle
- budget for intellectual assets management in the CRP

2. CRP full proposal evaluation criteria for intellectual asset management

The CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan included in the CRP full proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

1. provides a clear overview of intellectual asset management in the context of the CRP which instills confidence that intellectual assets will be managed effectively and strategically by CRP partners (i.e. in a manner which maximizes global accessibility and impact with due regard to best practices and the CGIAR IA Principles);

2. demonstrates effective decision making structures for intellectual asset management in the implementation of the CRP;

3. demonstrates effective planning for intellectual asset management at CRP proposal stage;

4. demonstrates effective planning for intellectual asset management across the CRP lifecycle;

5. demonstrates sufficient capacity for effective intellectual asset management in the implementation of the CRP;

6. demonstrates sufficient resource allocation for effective intellectual asset management in the implementation of the CRP.

---

13 It is important to note that dissemination in a CRP context involves not only dissemination of international public goods (i.e. CGIAR’s traditional model for dissemination) but also the exploitation of CRP results, including through the use of intellectual property protection.
3. Guidance regarding intellectual asset management at the CRP full proposal stage

i. Identifying technologies relevant to the CRP

Formulation of CRPs’ Flagship Projects and Clusters of Activities should involve assessing the state-of-the-art associated with the CRP outputs and outcomes. State-of-the-art assessments are an important method for identifying third party technology relevant to the CRP as well as a tool for identifying desirable CRP partners. Accordingly, such assessments are an important tool for developing the partnership strategy covered in Section 2.3 of this Guidance.

It is recommended that state-of-the-art analyses include the following actions:

- screen the already existing project landscape
- examine existing scientific literature
- search in patent databases

Patent database searches are also an important tool for conducting due diligence to determine risk exposure for infringement of third party rights (see further Section 4.2. below). A patent map which conceptualizes partnership potential and infringement risk is included in Annex 1.

CRP full proposals are required to include an overview of intellectual assets management in the CRP as part of their CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan. Results of state-of-the-art assessments which are of strategic significance to intellectual asset management in the CRP should be identified in the overview.

ii. Preliminary planning and negotiations with CRP partners

Preparation of the CRP full proposals provides an important opportunity to set clear expectations with prospective partners regarding CRP planning and implementation. Preliminary negotiations should ready partners for the subsequent negotiations to be undertaken at CRP implementation stage at a more granular and identify issues which may require further consideration or operate as deal-breakers. Key considerations for negotiations with CRP partners at the planning stage are identified below.

a. CGIAR intellectual asset policy framework applicable to CRP partners

Take time to ensure that all prospective CRP partners are familiar with the CGIAR policy framework applicable to CRP partners and understand all CGIAR requirements regarding intellectual asset management in CRPs, including pursuant to:

- CGIAR IA Principles and their Implementation Guidelines;
- CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy and their Implementation Guidelines, which is dealt with in Section (x) of this Guidance.
b. Maintaining confidentiality

The preparation of the CRP full proposals will require prospective CRP partners to exchange valuable information regarding research activities and the intellectual assets that partners can contribute to Flagship Projects and Clusters of Activities. In order to avoid misappropriation or misuse of such information, CRP partners should consider concluding a Non-Disclosure Agreement or including confidentiality obligations in a memorandum of understanding before entering into negotiations for the submission of the full proposal. Such NDA or confidentiality obligations will establish the conditions under which partners can disclose information in confidence, and will therefore need to, inter alia, identify what information is to be kept confidential and define the permitted purpose of the disclosure in order to restrict the use of such information.

c. Intellectual assets and corresponding IP rights of prospective partners

In order to describe the research activities that partners intend to carry out in the CRP, partners need to identify what intellectual assets they will bring and what intellectual assets they need from the other partners involved. The intellectual assets may be either tangible (e.g. material) or intangible (e.g. data, know how or patents) in nature.

At CRP full proposal stage prospective partners should be able to identify on a preliminary basis, the intellectual assets likely to be needed for the implementation of the project and the potential IP rights attached to them. Any intellectual assets or IP rights intended to be excluded from the CRP should also be identified.

d. Third parties’ rights and freedom-to-operate

Prospective CRP partners should also consider IP rights associated with the intellectual assets contributed to and developed in a CRP. In particular, it is important to assess freedom-to-operate by analyzing whether the dissemination of the potential CRP outputs would infringe third parties’ rights. This is particularly important in relation to patents (due to the fact that patents are rights that only provide its owner with the right to exclude others from using the patented invention, but not with the right to commercially exploit it) and to genetic resources and traditional knowledge which may be subject to compliance requirements pursuant to the Nagoya Protocol.\(^\text{14}\) Thus, testing, commercializing or otherwise disseminating a product may inadvertently result in the infringement of a third party’s rights.

A failure to undertake appropriate due diligence regarding freedom-to-operate may hamper the future dissemination of CRP outputs and/or increase the costs of the CRP, since it would

---

\(^{14}\) The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity is an international agreement which aims at sharing the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources in a fair and equitable way. It entered into force on 12 October 2014.
be necessary to conclude licensing agreements with third parties for using their technology or require substantial modifications to the initial research plans. It also exposes CRP partners to significant legal risk in the event that a retroactive license cannot be negotiated with the rights holder.

At CRP full proposal stage a preliminary due diligence assessment should be undertaken in relation to CRP inputs which are critical to achieving the outputs and outcomes in the Clusters of Activities of each Flagship. Thus, partners should be requested to conduct freedom-to-operate searches to identify potential relevant patents or obligations arising pursuant to the Nagoya Protocol for their project and assess, inter alia, whether their prospective CRP inputs would infringe patents held by others or raise compliance concerns pursuant to the Nagoya Protocol. Similar arrangements should also be considered for other IP rights.

Results of freedom to operate assessments which are of strategic significance to intellectual assets management in the CRP should be identified in the overview of intellectual assets management in the CRP to be included in Section 1 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan (see further Section 3.1 below). For example, if an assessment concludes that a license is required to access and use third parties intellectual assets and related IP rights for technologies which are critical to the CRP, this should be identified and the plan for securing such rights or status of preliminary negotiations should be explained.

iii. **CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan**

A CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan based on the template provided in Annex \[x\] will need to be included in the CRP full proposal. As such, this Plan, although it will need to be adjusted during the lifetime of the CRP, will form part of the CRP funding agreements. The components of this Plan are further described in the sections below. In addition to containing CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan, CRP partner contracts should also specify ownership and licensing arrangements for intellectual assets and associated IP rights which reflect project level planning undertaken in accordance with the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan.

a. **Overview of intellectual assets management in the CRP**

Each CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan will need to contain an overview of intellectual assets management in the CRP (as detailed in Section 1 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan template). Given the relevance of this overview to the partnership strategy covered in Section \[x\] of this Guidance, it is highly advisable to start developing it in advance and in parallel with the partnership strategy for the CRP.
As part of this overview, an ‘Outline for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs’ will be completed and included as Exhibit A of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan. The purpose of this outline is for the CRP to summarize how it intends to develop and disseminate CRP outputs at Flagship and Cluster of Activity level (as already identified in Section X of the CRP Full Proposal) taking into account the key CRP inputs needed to achieve the intended CRP outcomes. The outline also flags anticipated private sector involvement and dissemination pathways involving restrictions to global access to facilitate self-assessment regarding the complexity of the intellectual management needs of a particular Cluster of Activities. This information will facilitate evaluation of the capacity needed to effectively manage intellectual assets within the CRP as well as facilitate comparisons across CRPs. The outline will also be used by CRPs to guide planning for the development and dissemination of CRP outputs below the Cluster of Activity level during CRP implementation.

As further detailed in the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan template, the remainder of the overview will consist of a narrative explaining the relevance of intellectual asset management in the implementation of the CRP, describing the results of any state-of-the-art assessments or freedom to operate assessments which are of significance to the design or implementation of the CRP, and providing an overview of the types of intellectual assets which are to be developed as CRP outputs and their dissemination pathways (including further development if relevant) in the context of the particulars of the CRP.

b. Planning for intellectual assets management in the CRP lifecycle

CRP partners will need to include as part of their CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan a description of the tools or methodology they will use for planning for effective intellectual assets management throughout the CRP lifecycle (as detailed in Section 2 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan template).

i. Tools for identifying anticipated CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination pathways during project planning

CRP full proposals need to identify anticipated CRP outputs and outcomes for the Clusters of Activities of each Flagship. Planning during CRP implementation requires a greater level of granularity at project level than what is required at CRP Full Proposal stage. Indeed, effective intellectual asset management during CRP implementation will require project level planning which identifies the project partner(s) responsible for developing or (co)developing specific CRP outputs (including their respective contributions of CRP inputs for this purpose), the existence of any associated IP rights or restrictions attaching to such (inferring respective rights to use and sub-licensing such CRP inputs and outputs for specific purposes), and the immediate dissemination pathway intended for such CRP outputs (including whether such pathway involves restrictions to global access).
It is therefore important for CRPs to develop tools to identify anticipated CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination pathways during project planning. This section of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan will present a summary of these tools in narrative form and be complemented by your proposed ‘Project Plan Template for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs’ to be included as Exhibit B of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan. Your proposed Project Plan Template must demonstrate the level of planning that will be undertaken by CRP partners at project level during CRP implementation. CRP partners will be required to operationalize the template (or implement equivalent templates or measures that fulfill comparable functions) during CRP implementation, if approved, to ensure consistency in project level planning for effective intellectual asset management.15

II. Tools for tracking actual CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination pathways during project implementation

To complement planning for the development and dissemination of CRP outputs at project level, effective intellectual asset management also requires project level tracking of partners’ actual CRP inputs and outputs, and the dissemination pathways actually used for CRP outputs. Tracking this information at project level is important for verifying that CRP projects are being implemented as planned at project level (including whether they are achieving their planned project level objectives). Aggregation of this information is important for verifying that Clusters of Activities and Flagships are being implemented as planned at CRP level (including whether they are achieving their planned outcomes at Clusters of Activity and Flagship level). As such the tracking of CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination at project level has an important monitoring and evaluation function and therefore contributes to the Results Based Management framework explained in Section [x] of this Guidance.

CRP full proposals will describe how CRP partners intend to track of CRP inputs, outputs and dissemination at project level during CRP implementation. This forms part of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan which will include a description of CRP planning for effective intellectual assets management throughout the project lifecycle. For example, such tracking could be implemented through annual reporting and managed manually or using specialized software. This component is in narrative form only.

c. Decision-making structures related to intellectual asset management at CRP level

To enable effective intellectual asset management, partners should consider the management of intellectual assets and IP rights when defining the CRP management and structure.

15 This could occur, for example, via contractual measures binding on all CRP partners and/or via CRP level policy establishing a system for coordinating project planning across CRP partners.
As further detailed in Section 3 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan template, each CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan will need to include the planned management structures and procedures related to decision-making within the CRP concerning intellectual assets management, including in relation to governance, policies, systems, structures, operational processes and risk management, as appropriate to the CRP.\(^{16}\)

CRP partners should identify policies, guidelines (or key issues to be addressed by policies or guidelines) which are anticipated to be developed at CRP level to guide decision making by partners concerning intellectual asset management and to promote sound intellectual assets management practices by partners (if any).\(^{17}\)

In addition to identifying the decision-making structures related to intellectual asset management, this section of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan will identify any specific issues related to intellectual asset management in respect of which the Lead Center will retain decision making authority (e.g. re approval of Limited Exclusivity Agreements, Restricted Use Agreements, and patents and applications arising in the context of the CRP).

d. CRP capacity for intellectual asset management

To enable effective intellectual asset management, partners should carefully consider the demands that the management of intellectual assets and IP rights will entail. In particular, Lead Centers and their partners should ensure that the CRP has sufficient capacity and expertise regarding intellectual property, technology transfer and business development.

This capacity will need to be described under Section 4 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan.

What constitutes adequate capacity for intellectual asset management will be specific to each CRP according to its needs. For example, CRPs with significant private sector engagement or requiring complex licensing arrangements (i.e. for the acquisition of third party intellectual assets and/or dissemination arrangements) will likely require a higher degree of support and specific expertise as compared with CRPs which do not have such characteristics.

\(^{16}\) For example, a manager, committee or even a consulting body of external experts from industry could be considered to advise management regarding issues related to dissemination (and if relevant exploitation) and intellectual property. The proper structure will depend on the measures foreseen in each CRP.

\(^{17}\) Examples include the following: intellectual asset management and governance in CRP; intellectual asset ownership, licensing and dissemination in CRP; reporting/tracking of intellectual assets/IP rights and dissemination in CRP implementation; maximizing global access and impact (Limited Exclusivity Agreements, Restricted Use Agreements, patents, plant variety rights and confidentiality obligations); approval of Limited Exclusivity Agreements (including deviations to research and emergency use requirements), Restricted Use Agreements, patents or plant variety rights by CRP partners; considerations for partnering with the private sector; and genetic resource management (applying the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture or the Nagoya Protocol at CRP level). Note, Open Access is not included in this list as this is dealt with in Section [x] of this Guidance.
e. CRP budget for intellectual assets management

Effective intellectual asset management requires the CRP to budget for all anticipated costs associated with intellectual asset management throughout the life of the CRP. This includes, for example, costs associated with maintaining adequate capacity (e.g. employees and consultants of Lead Center and partners according to the time anticipated to be spent working on CRP related issues, training, capacity building), technological components (e.g. software tools for managing intellectual assets and IP rights), planned CRP activities (e.g. annual meetings, ad-hoc capacity building), externally planned activities (e.g. meetings of international treaties relevant to CRP), third party licensing fees, and potential patent, plant variety protection or trademark protection.

What constitutes adequate funding for intellectual asset management will be specific to each CRP according to its needs. For example, CRPs in which CRP outputs are comprised principally of information products are likely to require a greater focus on budgeting specifically for open access rather than on broader intellectual asset management needs.

Each CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan will need to include a description and table concerning the resources budgeted to support intellectual asset management throughout the CRP lifecycle, as per Section 5 of the CRP Intellectual Asset Management Plan template.

Exhibit A: Outline for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Technology Support]</td>
<td>[insert 1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[insert 2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Capacity]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Activities]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Licensing and royalties]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Patents, plant variety protection and trademarks]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit B: Project Plan Template for the Development and Dissemination of CRP Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRP [x]</th>
<th>[Key/indicative] CRP outputs and (co)developers(s) (if known) which are anticipated to be associated with CRP outcomes and results at Flagship/CA level</th>
<th>[key/indicative] Dissemination pathway(s) anticipated for CRP outputs</th>
<th>Anticipated global accessibility of the [key/indicative] CRP outputs (e.g. due to confidentiality, third party IP rights or exclusivity arrangements)</th>
<th>Restricted CRP inputs (if any anticipated) and contributor(s) (if known)</th>
<th>Private sector partner involvement in development or dissemination of CRP outputs (if any anticipated)</th>
<th>Anticipated level of complexity for intellectual asset management (self-assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief description e.g. Center repository; variety release via Center nursery; variety release via NARS/partner; commercial licensing (exclusive; non-exclusive; or TBD(^{18}); other (specify)</td>
<td>Unrestricted (U) / Restricted (R) / TBD</td>
<td>Yes (Y) / No (N) / TBD</td>
<td>Yes (Y) / No (N) / TBD</td>
<td>Highlight: Green (simple); Yellow (intermediate); Red (complex)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flagship 1

Cluster 1 etc

[Re output 1.1]

[Re output 1.2]

[Re output 1.3]

Flagship 2

Cluster 2 etc

\(^{18}\) “TBD” means ‘to be determined’