



# **ISPC comments on CGIAR portfolio to SMB July 2016**

**Maggie Gill, ISPC Chair**



Independent  
Science and  
Partnership  
Council

# Process for submission of strong portfolio

- Process 31 March to date
- Brief overview of 31 March submissions
- Difficulties experienced by ISPC
- Requests for 31 July submission

## Process 31 March to 11 July

- 31 March submission of full proposals
- ISPC-commissioned 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

## Process 31 March to 11 July

- Four CRP leaders identified ‘factual errors’/sought clarification
- 7 July DCL Strategy submitted

# Progress with CRPs

*Acknowledging that:*

CRPs started from different bases and challenges of CRPs are different (e.g. one crop vs many)

- Good *progress* (and positive feedback) on cross-Center working
- Good *progress* with integration and coherence

## No ranking/rating/scoring

At this stage evaluations were conducted against criteria in the Guidance Notes leading to 3 (three) 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

## 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*

# Principles of Feedback

- Commentaries represent a TEAM effort
- Collective agreement on key points
- No lobbying for changes in specific views
- ISPC aims to avoid giving direction
- ISPC trying to minimize further rewriting
- Errors will be acknowledged



# Difficulties experienced by ISPC

- How to handle DCL
- Number of pages included (including Annexes)
- Multiple versions of CRP budgets
- CRPs included different sets of activities in 'management' and 'impact assessment'

# Solutions

## Implemented

- Asking advice from SC on allowing DCL more time – answer tomorrow
- Agreed response format with CRP leaders to minimize rewriting/re-reviewing

## Requested from SMB

- Each Flagship starts by summarizing budgets by Windows and by amounts secured or to be found.
- Agree definitions of activities to be included as ‘management’ and ‘impact assessment’

## Suggestion

- System Management Board to prepare a portfolio commentary which:
  - summarizes budgets; and
  - updates the 'heat map' provided by the former Consortium Office on alignment with SRF, using the final figures