

CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)

Summary Report from the Technical Design and Implementation Meeting

22-23 July, 2009
IFPRI, Washington, DC

A Technical Design and Implementation Meeting on CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) took place on July 22-23, 2009. The meeting brought together over 50 participants from all CGIAR Centers as well as other key actors in agricultural research (see Annex I for List of Participants). The goals of the meeting were to:

1. To review initiated prototype work that seeks to delineate major production, environmental service and institutional systems of relevance to formulating the CGIAR's SRF.
2. To review the conceptual approach and methods, as well as responsibilities and timelines, for quantitative assessment (modeling) of the potential impacts of the CGIAR's research for development, as an input to the identification and selection of Mega-Programs.
3. To agree on the scope, methods and processes required to undertake an elicitation (survey) of scientific opportunities and potential impacts through both quantitative and qualitative approaches (that capture the full span of production, resource, ecosystem service, social and policy dimensions of the CGIAR's potential research portfolio) as outlined in the SRF Committee's Progress Report No. 3.

The full Agenda of the meeting is attached in Annex II.

Session 1: *Context, Goals & Objectives of SRF and the Technical Meeting*

(See also attached PPTs for [J. von Braun](#) and [M. Rosegrant](#))

Context and approach (J. von Braun and D. Byerlee)

Key messages:

- Criteria for making choices for research opportunities and prioritization will be an important outcome of this workshop and will feed directly into the choice of Mega Programs (MPs).
- Resulting MPs will need a narrative and broad financial scope and will need to show how they contribute to three Strategic Objectives (which will not be revisited here). They should have concrete developmental and scientific impact, be doable, and represent CGIAR's comparative advantage.

- Invited participants are here not to recommend a portfolio of MPs; they should not represent their home research institutions but think outside of the box, as premiere technical experts to find the best methods, integrated set of processes, analytical tools and processes not only to meet immediate needs but also to provide the basis of a much needed future CGIAR strategic capacity.
- We need to think about how our current research fits into the proposed MPs and how we could map it into MPs. How will we need to, downsize, expand or re-orient current research streams to support a new MP portfolio.
- We need to take into account the changing context for CGIAR, especially taking into account the recent developments on food security during G8 summit; there is a donor fatigue and we need to ensure that we deliver on the promises of CGIAR reform.

Next steps:

- Timeline for the delivery of the draft report by the SRF committee is tight and due by mid September, with ongoing consultation organized by the committee, and delivery of the final report by the SRF committee in October. These are political deadlines that cannot be changed.

Implementation plans and workshop goals (M. Rosegrant)

Key messages:

- The goals of the workshop are to review the current and planned work and provide technical input into modeling, spatial analysis and scientific elicitation; these three processes will then feed into the subsequent process of designing specific MPs and the entire MP portfolio.
- Working together on the current SRF needs can help lay the foundation for developing a CGIAR-wide strategic research evaluation capacity; we need to see how this SRF process will be used in the future and improved.

Key questions from the following plenary discussion

- What is the interaction between challenge programs (CPs), systemwide/ecoregional programs (SWEPs) and MPs? Will CPs and SWEPs be phased out and incorporated into MPs? Will MPs be inclusive of all CGIAR research? Will any research be allowed outside of MPs?
- How do we ensure appropriate level of aggregation in the analysis we are undertaking? What is the scale of the research investment units of MPs?
- Are we missing the voice of CG institutions? We are working on the “what” but not yet on the “how” of institutional participation in a shared research agenda that transcends centers.
- The importance of partnerships: how will other partners be involved in the reform process? How do we ensure a demand-driven research agenda and a bottom-up approach? Is GFAR process enough to get stakeholders’ input on the CGIAR reform process and in particular on the development of specific MPs, and will it be completed in time for the formulation of MPs?
- Are we doing enough to elicit contributions from the partners and stakeholder, scientists and non-scientists?
- How to select among models – what criteria to use? How will the product streams of the three “Trusts” be integrated? How to balance Models, Wisdom, and Science?

- How to take account of NRM management and NRM policy?
- How do we ensure that the outcome of the meeting is taken forward? What would be the final products of this meeting, and how will they be incorporated into next steps?
- CG size: How big will and should be CG in the future? How much of the envisaged funding is for the CG vs. the larger global R&D system?
- How do we ensure scientific rigor within the time given to undertake the analysis and deliver the final report?
- How do we link to the 96% of research that is not funded through the CGIAR?
- Is the CGIAR too focused on crop improvement?
- Spatial analysis exercise is attractive but we shouldn't get carried away by adding more and more data layers – we need to prioritize what is most important

Session 2: Experiences with Strategy Development and Priority Setting Approaches

Presentation Rounds

- [Cynthia Bantilan, ICRISAT](#)
- [Thomas Randolph, ILRI](#); Also see “[A framework for priority setting in international livestock research](#)”
- [Charles Crissman, CIP](#)
- [Bernard Hubert, Agrimonde](#)

Reflection and Synthesis

- David Raitzer, CGIAR Priority Setting Working Group (SPIA). On lessons drawn from the newly published CABI volume on CGIAR impact assessment and priority setting experiences (<https://hc.box.net/shared/static/8u5u1qzgi4.ppt>)
- John Lynam, on experiences with the Rockefeller Rice Biotechnology Program, the ASARECA Strategic Plan, and the last Science Council research strategy/priority setting exercise (Draft notes: <https://hc.box.net/shared/static/d075pep5ko.doc>).
- Howard Elliot, on thoughts on technical workshop and stakeholder involvement (<https://hc.box.net/shared/static/zvtr8jua7v.doc>)

Session 3: Planned Implementation Activities

(see also attached PPTs from [S. Wood](#), [S. Fan](#), [R. Meinzen-Dick](#), and [M. Holderness](#))

“Trust in models”

(a) Spatial Team

Key messages:

- The goal of the spatial exercise is to contribute to the design of the CGIAR Strategy and Investment Portfolio through geographic characterization and stratification. This should serve to broadly locate poverty/hunger and environmental challenges and define zonal

configurations that help identify opportunities/hotspots for CGIAR research now and in the future.

- The key questions in the ongoing work are; What is the appropriate level of granularity of spatial analytical units (country-level unit vs. environmental zones, etc.)?; how specific should they be to individual research themes?; should they indicate current or potential hotspots for research? (e.g. how much to factor in limited spatial information about drivers of change); The research is further complicated by poor sub-national spatial representation of key human outcome variables (e.g., poverty and hunger).

Immediate next steps:

It would be beneficial to, at this point, to see if we can reach agreement on a common spatial typology to apply at the CGIAR “apex” level of zoning that would be valid for all (current and potential) CGIAR R&D themes. But most immediate goal is to agree some global zoning typology that could serve to provide spatial context for respondents to the Science Elicitation.

(b) Impact and Investment Modeling Team

Key messages:

- Based on the example of the [ASARECA Strategic Planning](#) study, as subsequently extended and improved [study for Central and West Africa](#), there could be three elements of the modeling analysis; economy-wide multimarket modeling of the potential sectoral and GDP growth and poverty reduction impacts of R&D, partial-equilibrium models of R&D-induced, adoption and productivity change of a single commodity (e.g., DREAM), and optimal investment targeting/scaling analysis for achieving productivity and poverty reduction impact.
- Some key indicators concerning future demand expansion, trade, and prices, as well as linkages to climate change and future water resource constraints might be taken from relevant IFPRI IMPACT model results.
- Investment analyses will assess how best to allocate a given R&D investment among major developing regions in order to: a) maximize global agricultural production, and b) minimize global poverty, as well as to assess what might be the optimal scale of the CGIAR system given some insights into its past and potential developmental impacts.
- The modeling streams (growth and poverty, technology impact, and portfolio) could provide a dynamic, economy-wide modeling framework that supports evaluation of CGIAR contributions to overall economic growth and poverty reduction country by country as well as the optimum amount of agricultural investment.

Next steps:

- Discussion of possible economic models would take place during the breakout sessions.
- Other models need to be identified that might explicitly link to environmental and ecosystems resilience aspects of the CGIAR vision.
- NOTE: See also [Modeling Postscript](#)

“Trust in Frontline Researchers”

Scientist Elicitation: Questionnaire, Poverty workshop, Gender consultation

Key messages:

- Recent e-consultations on gender and the brainstorming workshop on the current status and future of poverty research in the CGIAR (June 19, 2009) strongly recommended not only the establishment of Poverty Platform to guide CG poverty research but also incorporation of gender as a cross-thematic research area as well as MP.
- Scientific elicitation is now planned, through an online questionnaire, to solicit researchers’ views on possible CGIAR research linked to three strategic objectives (food for people, environment for people and policies for people).

Next steps:

- Draft questionnaire will be discussed during the workshop and distributed to researchers shortly in order to meet the end of August deadline for recommendations to SRF.

“Trust in Wisdom”

Stakeholders and partners: GFAR stakeholder and partner dialogues and GCARD

Key messages:

- GCARD is a biennial global conference on agricultural research for development organized by GFAR. GCARD aims to develop a new global agricultural research system that directly impacts the poor. GCARD process is supposed to be the final output of the e-consultations and face-to-face discussion on CGIAR reform, SRF and new research priorities inside and outside of CGIAR (Agriculture Research for Development - AR4D).
- GCARD conference is where the doers and donors/funders come together but GCARD process takes top-down CGIAR reform process to face-to-face regional discussion.

Next steps:

- GFAR is in the process of launching the regional review process and e-consultations at the beginning of September. GFAR will continue the engagement with CGIAR SRF and MP team to ensure cohesion.

Session 4: *Parallel Working Group Sessions* (July 22) and Plenary (July 23)

Four working groups were formed to discuss separately: a) scientist elicitation questionnaire; b) possible models to be used in the modeling exercise; c) zoning typology/issues and characterization of spatial systems; d) need for stronger partnerships and stakeholder consultations. Members of each group sent out ambassadors to other groups halfway throughout the breakout session in order to enable cross-fertilization and to understand possible linkages and the flow of data/inputs across different exercises.

Key outcomes

a) Scientist elicitation working group

Key messages:

- Based on the input provided by the participants of the working group, the questionnaire will be focusing on ‘big opportunities’ in agricultural research that might have been undervalued/need to be taken up or expanded; the researchers will be asked to identify exciting opportunities, think outside of the box in their area of specialization, to focus on innovation but with the possibility of scaling up.
- Questionnaire should be adding value to the research prioritization at the strategy/global level without displacing the priority setting done within the centers or repeating work already undertaken.
- Questionnaire will elicit both quantitative and qualitative information and hence might not be directly feeding into modeling and/or spatial exercises although there is some scope to incorporate some of the data gathered. Questionnaire will try to pin down a spatial domain for each intervention, but allow respondents to select that domain, rather than use only predetermined spatial domains, as different types of innovations have different types of spatial domains.
- Scientist elicitation will target both researchers inside and outside of CGIAR system to ensure broad participation and also innovative thinking. Questionnaire will be sent out to frontline scientist and generalist researchers/research managers in agriculture and rural development area to guarantee a variety of ideas and suggestions.
- Impact assessment focal points of centers may have already collected impact-related parameters for research opportunities, which can feed into the models. Questionnaire has a tight deadline and there were concerns whether there was enough time to reach a representative audience. Because this is not “voting” for particular innovations but eliciting the possibilities, what is key is to cast the net broadly to get maximum coverage in the short time frame.

Next steps:

- Draft questionnaire will be distributed to the participants of the workshop and revised based on the comments received by the end of July. It will be subsequently officially launched through online ‘survey monkey’ with input expected by mid-August and the draft report with recommendations to be prepared by the end of August.
- It was subsequently agreed with GFAR representatives that the scientist elicitation would be coordinated to ensure that NARs scientists and others (e.g. in NGOs) who have good ideas on innovations would have a chance to identify innovations, but they would not be confused or bothered by getting 2 similar but slightly different questionnaires. Then this scientist elicitation would be used in the GFAR e-consultation process to ensure full participation of a variety of stakeholders.

b) Modeling working group

Key messages:

- The discussion in the working group revolved around the issue of what prioritization through modeling meant, with some suggesting focusing on a subset of building blocks that could be sorted into MPs. There were also questions regarding the unit of research that models would work with and whether the models could simply ‘home in’ on a subset of research.
- A big knowledge gap was identified when trying to understand the impact multiplier from smaller investment units to productivity increase, enhancement of ecosystem services, etc. and what causes the increase in productivity, etc. that then leads to reduced poverty, etc.

There was a particular challenge in applying the models for natural resource management (NRM) issues.

- Policies on trade, inputs, etc. were identified as fairly easily handled in a modeling framework, although it's much easier on macro-level than on micro-level.
- Given the ongoing spatial exercise, it was pointed out that highly aggregated sets of the spatially-explicit data would likely be needed for the purposes of the economic modeling/analysis.
- See also [Modeling Postscript](#)

c) Spatial working group

Key messages:

- It was suggested that the technologies/research opportunities from the questionnaire should be elicited according to relevant geographical target locations. Such maps of scientific opportunity could then be layered over maps of human welfare and environmental resilience challenges such as poverty, hunger, potential climate change impact. While the questionnaire would be rather 'aspatial', it could still provide information pertaining to the use of and potential impacts of specific groups of technology in a geographically contained zone/space.
- It would be best (improve the quality/utility of the elicited data) to link spatial information with the scientist elicitation questionnaire using zoning systems that scientist are most familiar with. It is feasible but not tractable in the context of this time frame to ask each scientist to submit their preferred zoning schema. Agreed that; (a) geopolitical (regions, countries), (b) agroecological zones and (c) "farming systems" (FAO/WB that include crop, livestock, forest and fisher livelihoods), likely covers most needs. It was clear from the discussion that there was a need to cross-reference the data/inputs from both scientist elicitation and spatial exercises.
- The group discussed both the need for spatially-explicit outcome variables (e.g. poverty, hunger, health, natural resource degradation), and well as other development conditioning variables, e.g., use of development domains as in ASARECA study. A variety of possible approaches and datasets were identified, including the application of the development domain approach using statistical methods.
- There was a need to better understand what level of aggregation/level of specificity was needed for the current exercise (e.g. what is the notional scale of R&D investment/impact units to be used as the building blocks of the SRF analysis).

Next steps:

- Work with the Scientist Questionnaire team to insert spatial specificity options into the questionnaire. Better identification of these expected zones of opportunity/impact will improve the relevance and utility of the analysis (quantitative or qualitative) of the information elicited.
- IFPRI team will work through the established CSI data sharing and message site to finalize availability and use of needed layers for human welfare, production systems and environmental resilience

d) Partnership working group

Key messages:

- There was a concern that not all of the key knowledge gaps may be picked up in MPs, i.e. rural-urban linkages, minor crops, etc. While they might not be considered CG research priorities, they should be nonetheless taken into account.
- Regional reviews are being currently organized by GFAR in order to pull out regional priorities and demands and to understand how well current research fits with what is really needed on the ground. The e-consultations in early September, region by region, will however also include specific questions around the CG's program.
- It was unclear to whom the scientist elicitation is targeted and the participants urged that both the CG and non-CG researchers should be reached out to during the process.

Next steps:

- SRF and GFAR e-consultations should both be concluded by the end of September when the two processes come together for further discussion at regional face-to-face meetings (with the purpose of cross-validation). The process should be finalized before ExCo and the business meeting in December.

Follow-up Q&A Summary

- One of the key concerns regarding the current exercises revolved around the unit of analysis (for all three exercises) and the key parameters needed.
- It was unclear whether questionnaire can really feed into the models and also create parameters or whether expert opinion would come in after the models are run.
- Some participants suggested that CG centers' scientist should be involved more in the process, especially in the scientist elicitation, and the questionnaire should be replaced with face-to-face discussion. External participants in the questionnaire and GFAR consultations could be used to get the parameters from outside of CG, including NGOs. Some suggested different questionnaires for different groups. [This was later resolved by coordinating the scientist elicitation and GFAR, and doing a broad invitation to CG and non-CG people.]
- Some suggested that each MP would need a social venture fund to invite innovative solutions from outside. It is clear that local communities and NARS need to be intimately involved in the country-level programs.
- Young people would need to be engaged and a way to do it could be through additional PhD Fellowships.
- It is clear that triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data would need to take places.
- We need to ensure that environmental and health issues would be addressed by the ongoing exercises but taking into account that there a lot of groups/institutions already working on these issues and hence collaboration with NGOs should be encouraged for adoption of new technologies.
- Given that models need good data, we need to recognize areas in which we do not have the required information. We should look at what other institutions are doing in these areas where information is not available. On the other hand, there are already a lot of data available that CG has been collecting for years and only limited data is needed from the private sector.
- We need to consider integrated strategies and not single technologies for solving problems.

Session 5: *Moving to MPs and the SRF: Criteria, Indicators, & Processes*

(see also PPT from [D. Byerlee](#))

Key messages:

- We need to agree on what the building blocks are before moving on to MPs. They need to be just a bit lower than the scale of a MP. But we also cannot do it at the scale of disease x crop y region z.
- The MPs we have will be skeletal programs with very broad objectives; subsequent process will then develop the business plan with detailed program for all the centers.
- We need to think of the types of indicators that we can deliver on to reach the impacts/results within the next six years. Much of what we will be doing will be based on ongoing work in the CG. But we are not taking what the CG is doing and simply repackaging it.
- The modeling is not the core of the SRF. It is a tool we are using to provide evidence, as is the questionnaire. Many inputs will go into the SRF and much of what we will bring in will be qualitative. We should not push the modeling work to what we cannot model well. We need to keep a balance between analytical work and the quantitative inputs coming in from many other sources. We do need advice on how to integrate the different strands of work.
- Criteria and indicators that will help us transition into MPs will need to be simple and selective. Some are overarching and some relate to individual SOs.
- But we also need to think about “System/domain” specific in hot spots for achieving SOs and as building blocks.

Session 6: *Ad-hoc Breakout sessions and Wrap-up Plenary*

- Breakout sessions were divided into four groups that discussed the following topics:
 - Group I: Aggregation/disaggregation for building blocks (S. Wood and M. Rosegrant)
 - What are the building blocks?
 - What do we know about them?
 - How do we estimate key research impact parameters for each building block?
 - Group II: MP criteria and indicators (R. Meinzen-Dick)
 - System level: review and prioritize few criteria for overall SRF and identify relevant measurable indicators for each criteria
 - For each SOs: review and prioritize few criteria including programmatic criteria and identify relevant measurable indicators for each criteria
 - Group III: Integration of three trust streams (D. Byerlee)
 - How can three streams of trust (in models, science and wisdom) be integrated?
 - What are the criteria/considerations in aggregating building blocks into system, regional, global thematic and global commodity group MPs, and platforms?
 - Group IV: Working in the wider network (J. Waage)
 - What are the responsibilities of the CG and partners in the execution of SRF and mega programs?
 - How do we get input and perspectives from partners on design of mega programs?

Plenary Review

Key messages from four groups

Group I

- The group discussed in detail, but ultimately rejected the notion of collecting disaggregated technical data and analyzing them to identify the strategically important development challenges the CGIAR and its partners should be responding to. An alternate approach was agreed to first identify the key “problem domains” (development challenges) and then map what (if any) existing work (building blocks) exist in the CG’s current portfolio while recognizing (as Derek pointed out) that the SRF for the next 6 years will have to draw heavily on on-going work. This approach was also seen to facilitate identifying CGIAR partner needs/roles.
- Problem domains can be identified in several ways; recent reviews of human welfare, environmental sustainability, and the role of agriculture; the Visioning exercise of the CG Change process; the problem statements associated with the CGIAR’s current portfolio; information from partner strategies, and the outcomes of stakeholder processes (past processes? since uncertain sync with on-going GFAR processes).
- The Medium Term Plans (MTPs) of Centers could be used to identify the existing set of building blocks and, the scientist questionnaire will provide ideas for new frontiers. This could lead, however, to hundreds of building blocks and there is a danger of being swamped with detail that needs to be avoided at this stage. (Potential role of CGIAR’s new investment mapping tool noted in this context)
- The CG responses to key problems (development challenges) could then be mapped into; building blocks within the current CG portfolio (regardless of the Center affiliation of such blocks), building blocks that partners might have, new building blocks that CG or partners need to provide (especially drawing on science elicitation of new frontiers).
- An integrated and coherent inventory of problem domains is needed (needs to be rapidly assembled and agreed) in order that mapping to current CG and partner activities as well as activity gaps can proceed.

Group II

- CGIAR new vision should serve as a guiding principle for criteria and indicators.
- The group worked on the criteria for criteria (few, not overlapping, related to MDGs and CGIAR vision). There was discussion of possible overarching criteria such as: poverty reduction, increased food security, ecosystem resilience, reduced vulnerability, reduced gender disparity. Subgroups worked on identifying possible indicators for the first three of these. Vulnerability and gender disparity had been discussed by the poverty workshop and gender e-consultation, respectively.
- Given that current division of criteria (Table D) was not considered comprehensive, the overarching criteria were proposed as a new way of organizing the criteria.
- Nutrition, an important element of food security, was considered very important, but currently is not listed and it was suggested that it should have its own mention.
- The group also discussed how agriculture can contribute to or protect human welfare through good nutrition and prevention of diseases. The perception is increasing that nutrition is health's responsibility (a sub-sector) without recognition to any role of agriculture, a perception that should be corrected. Nutrition is actually an outcome of various sectors. The concept of agriculture and health for nutrition should be promoted.

Group III

- Building blocks were defined as spatial units with agro-ecosystems, and/or development challenges and opportunities. There would be a fairly large number of such building blocks (50-200).
- Some building blocks would then be aggregated into about ten MPs that are spatially defined, relate to specific agro-ecosystems, similar development challenges, and where poverty and/or environment are a big problem.
- The major ones would then be brought together under “hot spots”. Hot spots would be of global importance and their relevance would be measured against multiple criteria, such as poverty, environment, hunger, etc.
- This would result in the CG system working in new places and perhaps moving away from other.
- Integration would take place within a MP rather than in the context of multi-center work.
- CG system would also have to think about MPs and Platforms that go beyond regional work such as frontier science, climate change or genetic resources. Balance would have to be found between the hot spot, regional MPs and the Platforms.

Group IV

- The group defined responsibilities within partnerships as: bridging, brokering, catalyzing, building capacity (partners need to be on a more equal footing to engage in an effective partnerships), and monitoring and evaluation.
- Partnerships should begin at the identification stage of SRF and should be developed through the development and scale up process.
- It is important to bring together the timetables of SRF development/CGIAR reform and partnership building/consultations in order to have effective dialogue and support for the process.
- Designing of MPs should be an inclusive process with built-in flexibility and focus. Partnerships should cluster under the MPs.
- More should be on knowledge management and sharing (this could be another possible platform, in addition to gender and poverty).
- MPs need to leave behind a capacity to take over – an exit strategy.

Following Breakout Sessions (summary to be added, if possible)

- Development Challenges or Problem Domains
- Questionnaire elicitation (see attached summary)
- Spatial dimensions of environmental problems (drought, water stress, to add to poverty, hunger, etc. layers).

Key outcomes of the breakout session

Next steps:

- Questionnaire elicitation: there will be one common questionnaire on elicitation of new research opportunities (draft sent to participants on Friday with comments due on Tuesday, July 27, 2009). Lists of researchers will be compiled in consultation with GFAR and centers. The input will be analyzed by the end of August to feed into the Strategy Team and GFAR process.

- Spatial group: there is need for more work to capture data on NRM issues and stresses, including water, water stress, land degradation, feed deficits as well as to develop a typology or conceptual way to integrate them and link to poverty and hunger. Data sets and key individuals were identified.
- Development challenges/problem domains (where and on what to work): We need to identify the geographical footprint of the development challenges/problem domains (terminology discussion; the group had been using the term “hot spots”, but some thought this implied temporary, and others did not want to suggest that “hot spots” equated to MPs (there would need to be a limited (7-10?) number of big development challenges and likely a similar number of MPs, but does not mean they map one to the other. Many factors will influence MP design and configuration). Role of external consultations as well as spatial & science analysis is important in identifying problems in systems. Need to find appropriate terminology for geographic targeting and work on a definition, keeping in mind that the eco-region approach was already tried by TAC and did not work well in most regions). We therefore need to think not of continuous spatial regions but of shared contexts and problems. More work needs to be done to understand how the information would be compiled with the understanding that a lot of work has been done outside already and quick outreach is needed to better understand this.
- Strategy Team will need to review and clarify some of these issues in the upcoming meeting in London (26-27th July)

Session 7: *Moving Ahead - Summary* (C. Chartres)

- There is a fantastic opportunity at the moment given that G20 has made a very strong commitment to greater emphasis on sustainable agricultural development and food security.
- Aim of the ongoing process is to develop a clear and compelling SRF for CGIAR as a whole; this workshop played an important step in looking at your work on models, spatial analysis and scientist elicitation in order to help us identify areas of greatest needs and potential for international agricultural research to have development impacts.
- We struggled here with questions about trust in models, criteria for selecting MPs and key questions for our partners and ourselves. We still have a lot of work ahead on the spatial aspect of the work.
- We could move ahead with a two-stage process in terms of the modeling work: a) compile compelling evidence about where poverty, environment/degradation, food security are critical; and b) work in more details on domains and building blocks. We need to keep identification and design clearly separated in the process.
- We did not intend to discuss partnership, but it is critical and during the workshop some guiding principles for partnerships were developed. We already have many partners in centers and we need to examine this holistically throughout the development process. NARS, extension services, and other groups are critical, as well as ownership.
- Even if we have a draft of MPs by November, we need to recognize that GCARD process continues through March and we must allow further input to the eventual final MPs.
- Our next meeting in London will definitely be informed by the discussion during this workshop and we will aim to better define the spatial and modeling requirements to add considerable gravitas to the debate and presentations. For example, must decide whether a broader scenario-based approach to modeling as discussed in final break-out sessions might

be the most pragmatic approach for the immediate SRF needs, with other (“building block”) analyses following through to March deadline one candidate MPs are emerging.

- The world has changed and so the CG system cannot continue with business as usual scenario. We need science-driven solutions and so we will build on work already done to ensure added-value by combining work in centers concentrating not on “repackaging” but creating added-value and common goals.

Modeling Postscript

Perhaps more than other on-going and planned activities, there was most movement during the meeting on the scope of the “Trust in Models” work that could be completed for the mid-September deadline set out by the Strategy Team. By the end of the meeting the scope of the modeling had been reduced in a number of key areas and the Strategy Committee in its London meeting undertook to reflect further on those and provide additional guidance. Summarizing some important aspects of the re-calibration of expectations;

- (a) The Science Elicitation should not be called upon to produce sufficiently robust technical characterization of new science opportunities to support quantitative evaluation.
- (b) Evaluating the productivity impacts of individual research components (dubbed potential MP “building blocks” during the meeting) was likely infeasible and unnecessary at this stage (for the September deadline), but more might be done on this for a March 2010 (GCARD) timeframe. If the second phase of modeling moves forward after September, additional elicitation of impact-related parameters for research opportunities will be undertaken in consultation with Center impact focal points. For the September timeframe the focus would more realistically be on (i) scenario-based analyses of broadly defined productivity impacts, (ii) compatible estimates of likely aggregate growth and poverty outcomes of overall investments in agricultural R&D, (iii) appropriate scaling of the optimum CGIAR funding, and
- (c) The spatial analysis focusing on mapping of development challenges and opportunities.

Annex I: List of Participants

Name	Institution	e-mail
Andrew Jarvis	CIAT	a.jarvis@cgiar.org
Anil K Gupta	Indian Institute of Management	anilg@iimahd.ernet.in / anilg@sristi.org
Augustine Mokunwye		mokwunye@ghana.com
Bernard Hubert	INRA-France	bernard.hubert@avignon.inra.fr
Brian Belcher	CIFOR-Indonesia	b.belcher@cgiar.org / Brian.Belcher@RoyalRoads.ca
Charles Crissman	CIP-Lima	cip-ddg-research@cgiar.org
Cheryl Doss	Yale University	cheryl.doss@yale.edu
Colin Chartres	IWMI- Sri Lanka	c.chartres@cgiar.org
Cynthia Bantilan	ICRISAT-India	c.bantilan@cgiar.org
Dan Gilligan	IFPRI	d.gilligan@cgiar.org
Dave Hoisington	ICRISAT-India	d.hoisington@cgiar.org
David Molden	IWMI-Sri Lanka	d.molden@cgiar.org
David Raitzer	IRRI	d.raitzer@cgiar.org
Derek Byerlee	Science Council Member and Impact Assessment Chair	dbyerlee@gmail.com
Dominique van der Mensbrugghe	World Bank	dvandermensbrugg@worldbank.org
Douglas Gollin	Williams College	douglas.gollin@williams.edu
Florence Egal	FAO	Florence.Egal@fao.org
Frank Place	World Agroforestry Centre	f.place@cgiar.org
Glenn Hyman	CIAT	g.hyman@cgiar.org
Godfrey Bahiigwa	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) Secretariat, Uganda	director@pma.go.ug
Graham McLaren	Generation Challenge Program	g.mclaren@cgiar.org
Howard Bouis	HarvestPlus	h.bouis@cgiar.org
Howard Elliott	Independent consultant	howardelliott@shaw.ca
Ibrahima Bamba	WARDA	i.bamba@cgiar.org
Jacky Ganry	FAO	Jacky.Ganry@fao.org
Jeff Waage	London International Development Centre (LIDC)	Jeff.Waage@lidc.bloomsbury.ac.uk
Joachim von Braun	IFPRI	j.vonbraun@cgiar.org
John Lyman	CIAT	jlynam@africaonline.co.ke
Joseph Jojo Baidu-Forson	Bioversity International	j.baidu-forson@cgiar.org
Larry Harrington	Challenge Program on Water and Food c/o CIMMYT	lwharrington@gmail.com
Maarten van Ginkel	ICARDA	m.vanginkel@cgiar.org
Mahendra Shah	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis	shah@iiasa.ac.at

	(IIASA)	
Marie Ruel	IFPRI	m.ruel@cgiar.org
Mario Herrero	ILRI	m.herrero@cgiar.org
Mark Holderness	FAO	mark.holderness@fao.org
Mark Rosegrant	IFPRI	m.rosegrant@cgiar.org
Meredith Soule	USAID/EGAT/ESP	MSoule@usaid.gov
Nancy White (FACILITATOR)	Full Circle Associates	nancyw@fullcirc.com
Norbert Henniger	World Resources Institute	norbert@wri.org
Nuhu Hatibu	The Kilimo Trust	nuhu.hatibu@kilimo.co.ug
Patrick Dugan	The WorldFish Center	p.dugan@cgiar.org
Rodomiro Ortiz	CYMMIT-Mexico	r.ortiz@cgiar.org
Ruth Meinzen-Dick	IFPRI	r.meinzen-dick@cgiar.org
Shaun Ferris	Catholic Relief Services	sferris@crs.org
Shenggen Fan	IFPRI	s.fan@cgiar.org
Simon Cook	CIAT	simonernest@gmail.com
Stan Wood	IFPRI	s.wood@cgiar.org
Steve Franzel	ICRAF	s.franzel@cgiar.org
Thomas Randolph	ILRI-Nairobi	t.randolph@cgiar.org
Thomas Walker	Independent consultant	walkerts@msu.edu
Victor Manyong	IITA-Tanzania	V.Manyong@cgiar.org
Xinshen Diao	IFPRI	x.diao@cgiar.org

Annex II: Meeting Agenda

CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) Technical Design and Implementation Meeting 22-23 July 2009, IFPRI, Washington DC Conference Room 4ABC

Goals of the Meeting:

1. To review initiated prototype work that seeks to delineate major production, environmental service and institutional systems of relevance to formulating the CGIAR's SRF.
2. To review the conceptual approach and methods, as well as responsibilities and timelines, for quantitative assessment (modeling) of the potential impacts of the CGIAR's research for development, as an input to the identification and selection of Mega-Programs.
3. To agree on the scope, methods and processes required to undertake an elicitation (survey) of scientific opportunities and potential impacts through both quantitative and qualitative approaches (that capture the full span of production, resource, ecosystem service, social and policy dimensions of the CGIAR's potential research portfolio) as outlined in the Strategy Team's Progress Report No. 3.

Draft Agenda

Wednesday, 22nd July

08:30- 09:00 Registration, Welcome and Introductions – Please arrive at or before 8:30 am

**09:00-10:30 Context, Goals & Objectives of SRF and the Technical Meeting
(Chair: Joachim von Braun)**

Goal: Set the context for the meeting, agree some shared terms and definitions, and establish the relevance of the SRF activities and outcomes within the broader CGIAR change process. In this session the deliberations of and the guidance already provided by the Strategy Team will be revisited, and the necessary timelines of the SRF process laid out. The early SRF design implementation and its expected outputs will be presented, as well as proposals on how to ensure appropriate engagement of CGIAR and broader scientific communities. Initial thoughts will be presented on how the Strategy Team proposes to use the SRF findings in moving to the formulation of an SRF with an innovative and balanced MP portfolio.

Context and approach

Joachim von Braun (Chair, SRF Team)

Additional remarks from Strategy Team members
Implementation plans & workshop goals

Derek Byerlee, Jeff Waage, Colin Chartres
Mark Rosegrant

Plenary Discussion of Scope, Objectives & Approach

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

**11:00-12:30 Experiences with Strategic Approaches and Related Analytical Studies
(Chair: - Tom Walker)**

Goal: What can we learn from prior strategic ex ante research prioritization efforts? What objectives were stated and what methods were employed? What were the pros and cons of those approaches? How did those studies utilize quantitative versus qualitative information? What research “units of analysis” were used, e.g., geopolitical or agro-ecological regions, production systems, commodities, intervention themes, technologies? Who was consulted? How were values/weights assigned and applied across multiple objectives?

Presentation Rounds

- Cynthia Bantilan, ICRISAT;
- Thomas Randolph, ILRI;
- Charles Crissman, CIP;
- Bernard Hubert, Agrimonde;

Reflection and Synthesis

- David Raitzer, CGIAR Priority Setting Working Group;
- John Lynam, Gatsby, ASARECA, Rockefeller

12:30-13:30 Lunch

**13:30-15:00 Planned Implementation Activities
(Chair: Meredith Soule)**

Goal: Share information on SRF activities that are already underway to assess the future challenges and opportunities. Seek guidance, identification of additional efforts required, and engagement. Progress on the three approaches laid out by the Strategy Team will be presented: (i) “Trust in models” includes definition and characterization of “systems” (e.g., geographic-cum-research thematic units) that will form the functional building blocks for assessing agricultural, environmental, and institutional/policy research challenges and opportunities, as well as evaluation of the nature and scale of potential R4D-induced impacts (by system) according to scenarios and parameter estimates established during the elicitation process; (ii) “Trust in Frontline Researchers” that designs and implements a science-focused elicitation of appropriate technical, institutional, and social variables to be used in assessing the potential impacts of research-induced change, grouped in ways that leverage the defined SRF “systems”; and (iii) “Trust in Wisdom”, the Strategy Committee will draw on consultations with a group of highly recognized research and policy leaders as reviewers at a later stage. In addition stakeholder and partner dialogues convened by GFAR and others are expected to play an important role.

“Trust in Models” Prototype “Systems” & Congruence Analysis	Stanley Wood
Potential Quantitative Evaluation Options	Shenggen Fan
“Trust in Frontline Researchers” Scientist Elicitation: Questionnaire, Poverty workshop, Gender consultation	Ruth Meinzen-Dick
“Stakeholders and partners” GFAR stakeholder and partner dialogues	Mark Holderness

15:00-15:15 Coffee break

15:15-17:30 Parallel Working Group Sessions (groups take coffee breaks on their own schedule)

Goal: The working groups will; (A) Review progress made to date on the systems mapping and characterization (that draws on the efforts of the CGIAR’s Consortium on Spatial Information, CSI), as well as the research impact evaluation and related modeling activities, and (B) Review the draft Scientific Opportunity elicitation instrument, survey protocol and administration process, and elicitation expert pool. Both groups will examine the key

information needs and what information can realistically be gathered or generated by end of August, to support the formulation of a preliminary short-list of Mega Programs (MPs), as well as to identify synergies between the MPs.

A: Trust in Models:

Systems characterization

Norbert Henninger

Quantitative research evaluation

Charles Crissman

B: Trust in Frontline Researchers:

Scientist elicitation (Questionnaire & protocols)

Doug Gollin

17:30-19:30 Reception

Thursday, 23rd July

**08:30-9:30 Plenary on Trust in Models/Trust in Frontline Researcher Recommendations
[Chair: Cheryl Doss]**

Working Group presentations & review

Harmonizing systems indicators, analytical units and data sources

Facilitation: Nancy White

09:30-10:00 From Priorities to MP Portfolio Design - Criteria and Indicators for MP Selection (Chair: Nuhu Hatibu)

Goal: Review and refine results criteria and indicators for the Strategy and Results Framework.. Assess how these are applicable to SRF as a whole and to individual Mega-Programs and/or clusters of Mega Programs. Based on the approaches described in Report #3 and today, the goal is to recommend a more concrete and specific set of criteria to evaluate both a relevant MP portfolio and the specific sets of indicators to assess the outcomes of CGIAR research. These must be developed and used to analyze trade-offs among potential Mega Programs. TBy the end of the morning we move from potential indicators to THE recommended indicators. Consider different approaches for different domains of CGIAR research: what commonalities are possible, and which approaches need to be tailored for each type of research?

Working groups to consider the various approaches presented and make recommendations on the most appropriate (e.g., method, tools and data) to be used for evaluating criteria and indicators related to strategic objectives of the CGIAR. What are recommendations for the process on transforming research priorities into a coherent portfolio of MPs?

From Priorities to MPs: A Process Proposal and Criteria/Indicator Needs

Derek Byerlee

10:00-10:15 Coffee break

10:15-12:00 Parallel Working Groups: Recommendations for Results Criteria and Indicators for MP Selection

MPs with a high weight on Food for People

Rodomiros Ortiz

MPs with a high weight on Environment for People

Simon Cook

MPs with a high weight on Policies for People

Frank Place

Across the Strategic Results Framework

TBA

12:00-13:00 Lunch

13:00 -14:30 Plenary Review of Selection Evaluation Activities: consensus indicators, systems, elicitation, evaluation methods and processes (Facilitator: Nancy White)

Working group reports

Concordance/harmonization of approaches

Coherence among indicators, systems, elicitation instrument and impact/outcome evaluation methods

14:30-15:00 Coffee break

15:00-17:00 Moving Ahead (Chair: Mark Rosegrant)

Plenary Review of timetable, information sharing, implementation responsibilities, consultation and final deliverables to Strategy Team

Closing comments from Strategy Team members