



ISPC issues for discussion with SC on CGIAR portfolio

Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

1. Recognizing the scale of the challenge
2. Can DCL progress on a different timescale?
3. Diversity of CRPs in terms of W1 and 2 funding and importance of W1&2 management
4. Consequences of funding decisions being at Flagship level
5. Impact Assessment
6. The potential of the integrating CRPs
7. Agreements with SMB

Scale of the task

- 21st century challenges needs cross-Center, interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary working – vision is ‘on message’ (SDGs)
- 15 Centers, 15 Boards, 15 cultures, operations and commitment/expectations in multiple developing countries
- Diverse disciplines but origins in crop-breeding
- SRF with 3 SLOs – trade-offs are inevitable and impact pathways complex
- Donors varying in investment levels, key priorities and priorities are dynamic
- Volatility of funding

Where have we come from and progress towards- integration across Centers

We started from 15 discrete programs developed over a 2.5 year period (2010-2013).

- Site integration – significant progress
- iCRPs – significant progress/potential
- AFS-CRPs – varying progress towards food systems rather than production
- 3 platforms – developed collaboratively

Characterising the portfolio

- GREAT opportunity – inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary at a global level (*trans-disciplinary meaning in this context meaning crossing the boundaries between research and development*)
- RISKS – conundrum of how to achieve flexible integration

Process 31 March to 11 July

- 31 March submission of full proposals
- ISPC-commissioned ~50 external reviewers reviewed 12 CRPs and 3 Platforms
- Meeting of ISPC in Lima to reach consensus on reviews – DCL risk highlighted to DGs
- 4 June commentary issued to DCL
- 16 June 14 commentaries plus a portfolio commentary released
- 16 and 17 June ISPC Chair and Executive Director met with Science Leaders

No ranking/rating/scoring

CRPs started from different baselines

At this stage evaluations were conducted against criteria in the Guidance Notes leading to 3 categories:

- 4 CRPs recognized as being at an ‘advanced’ stage (*but still asked for some changes*)
- 7 CRPs needing to strengthen proposal in one or more criteria + 2 to revise targets
- 1 CRP which started with a huge challenge and needs to clarify focus

DCL Issue

- Concern raised in May by all external reviewers and ISPC
- Key issues around focus
- ISPC is advisory not decision-making
- Treating DCL like others could by default have turned into decision-making

Risks associated with DCL

- Reputational risk to CGIAR if 'drylands issues' not part of portfolio
- Risk of potential poor funding outcome for DCL if resubmitted too soon
- Risks to overall quality and delivery of portfolio if DCL not focused

DCL Way forward

- ISPC preference to give DCL more time given challenges they faced
- Timeline set out in Guidance Notes and ISPC not empowered to change
- Governance changes meant no-one to ask during May/June
- Solution was to give DGs early warning and to get a strategy prepared

Where are we now?

- Strategy submitted on 7 July
- Reviewed by ISPC
- Headline comments:
 - Some issues addressed – signs of hope
 - Continuing lack of focus
 - Prioritization underway but will not be complete by 31 July
 - No strategic request for W1 and 2 funding
 - Targets not believable

Question for SC

Should DCL be given more time before resubmission without prejudicing their opportunities for accessing W1 and 2 funding or should they go ahead and resubmit (their preference) with the associated funding risks?

ISPC role

- To anticipate possible negative consequences (on science and delivery of outcomes) of decisions regarding allocation of W1 and 2 funding
- To help make the case for the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary science being undertaken within the portfolio which largely depends on W1 and 2 funding.

Quote from Guidance Notes for Call

'A coherent set of interconnected 2017-2022 pre-proposals to address the selected global challenges identified in CGIAR's 2016 – 2030 SRF'

Quote from SRF

What will be done differently:

Strategically building a more coherent and integrated portfolio of second generation CRPs that will collectively deliver System Level Outcomes by partners.

Diversity of funding at CRP level

Table 3. CRP funding for 2017 (million US\$)

CRP	Annual W1&2		Annual W3&bilateral	Total
	11.5		93.5	105.0
	8.7		17.5	26.2
	11.1		62.2	73.5
	20.2		23.3	43.5
	12.5		55.5	68.0
	16.4		62.2	78.6
	22.5		91.7	114.2
	15.0		28.0	42.9
	20.0		71.4	91.4
	21.5		35.6	57.1
	18.8		74.0	92.8
	10.0		40.0	50.0

Management budgets at CRP level

Table 3. CRP funding for 2017 (million US\$)

CRP	Annual W1&2	Management Amount (% of total)	Annual W3&bilateral	Total
	11.5	2.0 (1.9%)	93.5	105.0
	8.7	1.1 (4.2%)	17.5	26.2
	11.1	1.8 (2.5%)	62.2	73.5
	20.2	2.4 (5.5%)	23.3	43.5
	12.5	1.6 (2.4%)	55.5	68.0
	16.4	2.0 (2.5%)	62.2	78.6
	22.5	2.0 (1.8%)	91.7	114.2
	15.0	1.9 (4.4%)	28.0	42.9
	20.0	3.0 (3.3%)	71.4	91.4
	21.5	2.4 (4.2%)	35.6	57.1
	18.8	3.6 (3.9%)	74.0	92.8
	10.0	1.6 (3.2%)	40.0	50.0

Comments and questions on CRP budgets - management

Management budgets are only 8-16% of total
W1+W2 funding in total ~ \$25 million

Should/could they be separated out from the rest of
W1+2 funding – is there some way they could help to
justify W1/2 funding?

Comments and questions on CRP budgets – FP W1 and 2 allocations

CRPs have adopted different strategies for distributing the agreed total CRP W1 and 2 funding between Flagships.

If donors are going to make decisions at FP level – is there an issue of phasing which could be factored in?

Consequences of lack of W1 and 2 funding at FP level

ISPC thinking of commissioning a study on exploring if we can identify which are key FPs for overall delivery on SLOs – e.g. network analysis

Any information CRPs can provide?

Impact Assessment

- Budgets for IA range from < 1% to 7%

BUT

- CRPs have included a range of activities in the budget line 'Impact Assessment'
- ISPC thinks more should be spent on ex-post IA but that would be from W1 and 2 funds

Do donors agree?

Progress with platforms

- Genetic Gains and Big Data started from further back than CRPs
- All 3 Platform proposals were considered to be of high quality (*but still asked for some changes*)
- Main question on Platforms relates to budgets
 - Big Data in particular:

The data and knowledge products generated by the CGIAR arguably are assets of comparable social value to the content of the genebanks, which strongly suggests that CGIAR has dramatically underinvested in the curation and maintenance of these assets. This is the time to seize this opportunity

The potential of the integrating CRPs

2 out of the 4 integrating CRPs were in the 4 CRPs in ISPC's 'advanced' category

Agreements with SMB

- SMO will work on behalf of SMB to ensure consistency in finances and clarify Windows funding at FP level and to agree as far as possible consistency between CRPs in terms of activities allocated to activities such as CRP management and Impact Assessment