

## Way forward for other parts of the Portfolio

---

Purpose: To discuss the processes and timing for finalizing other parts of the Portfolio

Distribution Notice:

This document may be distributed without limitation.

Prepared by: System Management Office

22 March 2017

# Contents

---

1. Suggested actions for SMB5
2. Background
  - 2a. Recap 2016 System Council decisions
  - 2b. Rationale for September 2016 SC decisions
3. 8 March 2017 (via email) request for System Management Board input on proposed schedule for flagship programs:
  - 3a. Proposed schedule
  - 3b. Board input on proposed schedule
4. Possible steps for the way forward

## Suggested actions at SMB5

---

1. To discuss the possible new steps for the way forward for flagships determined by the System Council not to be eligible for 2017 Window 1/Window 2 funding.

*The next steps outlined take into account input provided by Board members and observers to the proposed schedule in an email on 8 March 2017.*

## 2a. Background: Recap SC 2016 decisions

---

### **September 2016, SC2:** The System Council:

- Approved programmatic elements of 2017 – 2022 CGIAR Portfolio of 11 research program and 3 platform proposals
- Preliminary 2017 funding decision<sup>1</sup> – “not approve the allocation of Window 1 and/or Window 2 CGIAR Trust Fund amounts for the 2017 implementation year to the following flagship projects ... with the System Council reserving its right to approve or decline Window 1 and/or Window 2 funds in future years:
  - Fish – Flagship 2;
  - Forests, Trees and Agroforestry – Flagship 2;
  - Livestock – Flagship 3 and Flagship 5
  - Water, Land and Ecosystems – Flagship 5”

### **November 2016, SC3:** The System Council:

- Approved for the 2017 calendar year, the allocation of US\$ 191.1 million W1-2 funds (“2017 W1-2 Allocation Amount”) for the approved 2017-2022 CGIAR Portfolio. Note decision point: SC/M3/DP2.

## 2b. Background: Rationale for September 2016 decisions

---

As the Council discussed elements of the proposed portfolio, the following themes emerged as broad principles:

- a. There is an overriding preference, whenever appropriate, for **flagships to be part of a designated CRP** because of the benefits coming from collaboration between all of the various activities, thus giving rise to a more coordinated picture of how research is being undertaken and outputs and outcomes are being delivered;
- b. Without in any way questioning the quality of the science proposed, the ISPC's questions on the **overall 'fit' of two flagships in the holistic Portfolio** resonated with the Council. Specifically, the Council queried the proposed inclusion of Maize flagship 5 and Fish flagship 3, taking into account the criteria of **coherence and comparative advantage**, and based on both the ISPC assessment and the donor-led review coordinated by the FEWG;
- c. Similarly, for another group of flagships (namely, Fish flagship 2; FTA flagship 2, Livestock flagships 2 and 5, and WLE flagship 5), there was a question on whether the respective proposals had **sufficiently articulated the compelling reason why the most valuable Window 1 and 2 resources should be directed to these flagships.**

## 3a. The 8 March 2017 Proposed schedule

- **When:** On 8 March 2017, the Board was asked for input on a proposed schedule, noting the CRP Leaders' preference for a shorter timeframe in order to bring as many decisions forward in the year as possible.
- **Rationale:** The schedule, discussed with the ISPC, represents a timetable which allows for CRPs have a few months to become accustomed to the new CRP structure and funding level (and, in several cases, new CRPs leaders to take up leadership).

Date Range	Description	Responsible party
January-July 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRPs accustoming themselves to new CRP working</li> <li>• Prepare revised proposal</li> </ul>	CRP management
31 July 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission of revised CRPs/FPs</li> </ul>	CRP management
August 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review of revised CRP/FP proposals</li> </ul>	ISPC
September 2017 (at ISPC meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRP Leaders or FP Leaders present updated FPs to ISPC</li> </ul>	CRPs with FP Leaders for ISPC review
October 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written recommendations on FPs provided</li> </ul>	ISPC
November 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision on funding for the whole portfolio 2018</li> </ul>	SC

## 3b. Inputs from Board members and observers

Input	From
<p>Preference for a sequenced approach, according to which the flagships could be resubmitted earlier and reviewed more quickly, and the CRP full proposal would be developed and submitted according to the proposed time line. Sequencing the two processes separately would allow earlier notification to the CRPs that have flagships under discussion. This would allow more lead time for them, including time to explore complementary external funding.</p>	<p>CRP reps: Karen Brooks and Victor Kommerell</p>
<p>I support Victor's comments that the decisions on the flagships should be made earlier than the decision on the new "drylands" CRP; otherwise we risk a logjam at the end of the year, and possible postponement of decisions into 2018. It should not be so difficult for the ISPC to review the FP proposals, as they will have been improved based on the ISPC's comments from 2016. Whereas reviewing a fairly new "drylands" CRP will be quite time-consuming.</p>	<p>Ann Tutwiler</p>
<p>I agree with the CRP Directors that the process for approving the 5 Flagships should be completed early in 2017. The ISPC preferred schedule is much too late and runs the risk that (a) flagships that do not get through the gate could be without funding for two years (b) the lateness in the planning cycle does not allow enough time to consider W1/W2 implications or for seeking alternative sources. The decision on this matter should also make clear what should be re-submitted –the entire CRP or just the reworked Flagships, and related budget and results tables?</p>	<p>Jimmy Smith</p>

## 4. Revised proposal drawing on inputs

---

- 'Early' window for presentation and ISPC review (May 30/June 30)\*
  - 'Late' window for presentation and ISPC review (July 30/August 30)
- 
- Board virtual endorsement (SMB7, 27 September, virtual)
  - System Council review (SC5, 9-10 November, Cali, Colombia)