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Where are we?

- Pre-proposals: ISPC 1\textsuperscript{st} review & ISPC guidance at portfolio level
- Post-FC ‘caveats’ Rome November 2015: All CRPs down to 57 FP’s & 2017 proposed budgets aligned to $900M/$170M W1&2
- Full Proposals: CO and ISPC 2\textsuperscript{nd} review & ISPC analysis at portfolio level
- Requirements revised proposals for 3\textsuperscript{rd} ISPC Review agreed – CRP Leaders have some issues
- Changes to Phase II proposal timetable noted, incl FEWG review in August – CRP Leaders have some issues
- CRP Leaders agreed next steps re: AFS- & GI-CRP collaboration, site integration (country coordination) & feedback to Big Data Platform proposal
Urgent: CRP Leaders’ issues with Phase II Process

1. In future, ISPC and funders agree on comprehensive set of proposal assessment criteria
2. Need to align CRP annual performance reporting with external evaluations and impact monitoring over time during Phase II; SMO, MEL CoP, IEA, ISPC need to work together on this
3. ISPC tell us more about who and how revised proposals will be reviewed
4. What if SC-FEWG comes to very different conclusions than ISPC? Can CRPs respond?
5. Allow for ‘CRP Mgmt Response’ after ISPC/FEWG reviews 12 Sept and SC meeting 26 Sept
6. Drop requirement to respond to CO comments on IA/IP & OD/OA sections
### Overview: Phase II CRPs Portfolio progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio characteristic</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cohesive Research Agenda** aligned with System-level Outcomes and Impact | ✓ Impact Pathways & Theories of Change per CRP & FP - linked to IDO’s-to-SLOs  
✓ Inter-CRP collaboration on what, where, reason why |
| **Help guide priority W1&2 investments, funding for next 6 years** | ✓ Core and uplift budget proposals with additional outcomes & high level 6YR workplan  
✓ Research priorities per FP core budget (not all CRPs) |
| **Effective Partnerships: Outside and Inside** | ✓ Each CRP has P’ship strategy  
✓ GIZ scaling-out P’ship with 8 CRPs; Other strategic p’ships  
✓ Country coordination initial activities & further plans  
✓ Inter-CRP collaboration on what, where, reason why |
| **Cross-cutting Themes (gender, youth, Cap Dev, Open Access)** | ✓ Updated gender strategies per CRP  
✓ CGIAR Gender Platform moves to PIM  
✓ Youth strategies per CRP  
✓ Cap Dev Strategies per CRP & existing Cap Dev CoP  
✓ OD/OA action plan per CRP & Platforms; Big Data Platform important role |
# CRP Leaders’ other concerns, proposals to SMB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Open Issue</th>
<th>CRP Leaders position</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition, Funding</td>
<td>Funding commitments for 2016: Will CGIAR Financial Plan 2016 for W1&amp;2 hold? ad hoc working group chaired by Eric Witte; financial alignment mechanism” which would allow centers to carry over unspent CRP1 funds into the new CRPs beginning in January 2017</td>
<td>Further cuts may affect CRP viability (e.g. minimum level program mgmt)</td>
<td>Find out from SC via SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Given current W1&amp;2 funding uncertainty, keep funds deployment as flexible as possible</td>
<td>Find out from SC via SMB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Urgent: CRP Leaders’ issues with Phase II Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Open Issue</th>
<th>CRP Leaders position</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase II funding modalities</td>
<td>What will be the principles for W1 budget allocation by SC in the future? How do they relate to ISPC and FEWG criteria? Are funders discussing use of W1&amp;2 in relation to W3/Bilateral? Assuming SC/W2 donors’ consensus on use of W1&amp;2, can they commit to a common reporting template for individual W2 donor reports?</td>
<td>CRP leaders want to be informed want to be consulted (e.g. contribute perspectives, inputs). want to see a portfolio and CRP performance management system (e.g. annual reporting, evaluations, outcomes monitoring, etc.) that would account for individual W2 donor reporting needs. At the very least, a common W2 reporting format.</td>
<td>Find out from SC via SMB Inform SMB SMB to push with SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP gov &amp; mgmt</td>
<td>Will there be follow-up on initial Rome/Nov 2015 ideas about simplifying CRP oversight / guidance structures</td>
<td>Give CRP leaders green light to take ideas further (e.g. one –ISC for several CRPs; - ISC members = several BoT’s Program Committee members = all externals)</td>
<td>Propose to SMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role and Responsibilities of SMO</td>
<td>What will be SMO core functions? What should be added (value add) functions? What’s going to happen to V4M analysis, ‘special projects’ ...?</td>
<td>CRP leaders would like to be consulted</td>
<td>Propose to SMB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Integration needs focus (and renaming)

Basis for

Internal CG coordination at country level

Establishing a sustained mechanism for collaboration amongst CGIAR entities

National engagement and alignment

Carrying out ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners and stakeholders to understand and align with the national priorities and actions and to establish and maintain partnerships

Streamlining policy engagement

Collecting the goals and targets of the SRF related to the particular country

Joint activities

Aligning research activities (also consider combined systems work; gender and inclusive growth)

Producing joint research outputs and public goods including knowledge, technologies, tools, methods, evidence, processes and platforms.

Rationalize and share CGIAR infrastructure, staff

Sharing CGIAR facilities, infrastructure and equipment

Making effective and efficient use of CGIAR staff

Coordinating research sites

Making use of a common set of research sites

What national gov & partners want is driver

National engagement and alignment

Collectively meeting the goals and targets of the SRF related to the particular country

Joint activities

Rationalize and share CGIAR infrastructure, staff

Making use of a common set of research sites

Separate dimension, CGIAR internally driven

Basis for

What national gov & partners want is driver

Rationalize and share CGIAR infrastructure, staff

Making use of a common set of research sites
Detailed information on Phase II CRPs
Portfolio progress
Context: ISPC portfolio analysis & IEA synthesis

- Proposed invests per sub-IDO: In all, not equally, quite well aligned with donor priorities
- CGIAR underinvested in curating, maintaining its data & knowledge products, time for change & IEA: Data-sharing across Centers a challenge
- Cross-CRP integration: Careful, manage expectations - Site integration: Early stages, inter-CRP collaboration critical to success
- Whole greater than sum of parts: Comes across, more to do
- Impact Pathways and ToC: Further improve & IEA: Avoid direct translation from ‘development’ context
- SLO targets: Big opportunity to sell CGIAR contribution, but sell CRP connections more evidence on scaling-up potential needed
- Cross-cutting themes: Sufficient people/skills to deliver on the many good ideas? & IEA: How to strengthen social sciences?
### Cohesive Research Agenda aligned with System-level Outcomes and Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Done</strong></th>
<th><strong>Need to clarify</strong></th>
<th><strong>To Do</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Impact Pathways & Theories of Change per CRP and FP - linked to IDO’s-to-SLOs | Achieve SLOs = Sum of several, all CRPs outputs-to-impact; linked to inter-CRP collaboration & P’ships-for-impact | How to assess, monitor progress towards SLO targets – MEL CoP & IEA & ISPC (!!)<br>
*Link to national SDG plans & monitoring (approaches, actors), e.g. Country Coordination activity* |
| Inter-CRP collaboration on what, where, reason why | Role of GI-CRPs vis-à-vis AFS-CRPs (global, thematic integrating, geo-specific levels) – in revised proposals | Complementarity of Big Data, Genetic Gains and Genebanks Platforms         |

See “Directions of Change” (a), (c), (e)
## Help guide priority W1&2 investments, funding for next 6 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Need to clarify</th>
<th>To Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core and uplift budget proposals with additional outcomes &amp; high level 6YR workplan</td>
<td>How will funders coordinate their W2 invests across portfolio, gap analysis? Principles for budget allocations? Critical mass of W1&amp;2 per CRP</td>
<td>SMB proposals to SC ?? (System Charter, Framework: Who drives resource mobilization – SC or SMB?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research priorities per FP core budget (not all CRPs)</td>
<td>Shared funder view of ranges of W1&amp;2 use vis-à-vis W3/Bilateral?</td>
<td>SMB facilitates with SC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicable, decision-informing definition of V4M that respects CRPs circle of influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effective Partnerships: Outside and Inside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Need to clarify</th>
<th>To Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each CRP has P’ship strategy</td>
<td>Future SMO role re: System-level P’ships: Any? What value add?</td>
<td>CRP Leaders input into SMO design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ scaling-out p’ship with 8 CRPs; other strategic p’ships (e.g. A4NH: WUR leads 1 FP)</td>
<td>Mostly (co-)funded by unreliable W1&amp;2; CRPs take different approaches (learning opp!)</td>
<td>See ‘Funding’ slide above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country coordination initial activities and further plans</td>
<td>Which countries want this? Where does CGIAR have leverage? Manage expectations, low dedicated resources, coordination funding</td>
<td>Site integration WG: Follow-up Montpellier June 2016; CRPs make clear what they budget where for 2017ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-CRP collaboration on what, where, reason why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See “Directions of Change” (b;b)
## Cross-cutting Themes (gender, youth, Cap Dev, Open Access)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Need to clarify</th>
<th>To Do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated gender strategies per CRP</td>
<td>How to gender-budget? CRPs need shared DAC marker approach</td>
<td>CRP Leaders learn from non-CGIAR, propose to SMB?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR Gender Platform moves to PIM</td>
<td>Define R &amp; R together with other CRPs; SMO to take on ‘accountability’ function?</td>
<td>PIM is working on it; SMB designing SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth strategies per CRP</td>
<td>Manage donor expectations, avoid ‘hot air’ syndrome, build capacity &amp; p’ships</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Dev Strategies per CRP &amp; existing Cap Dev CoP</td>
<td>See ISPC/IEA concern: Enough capacity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD/OA action plan per CRP &amp; Platforms; Big Data Platform important role</td>
<td>Future SMO role? Big Data Platform CGIAR-wide role? Focus on what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See “Directions of Change” (c), (d)