

Full report of the Strategy and Results Framework and Mega Program Development Workshop

17-20 February 2009
Bioversity Headquarters

Introduction and Background	1
Session: Drawing lessons from the past	1
Session: Aspirations	4
Session: Clarification of Impact Pathways	4
Session: Partner's Perspective	5
Session: Clarification of the concept of a portfolio of mega-programs and of mega programs.....	5
Session: Priority setting among the big development challenges and among potential Consortium Mega Programs.....	8
Session: Potential portfolio of mega programs	9
Session: Next steps leading to the design of a process for developing the Strategy and Results Framework and the mega programs.....	10
Closing Remarks.....	12
Annex I – Participant List	14
Annex II: Comments arising the group work and plenary discussions on the hypotheses of mega program portfolio and mega programs.....	15
Annex III: The of mega program portfolios produced by the working groups .	20
Annex IV: Timeline and proposed layout for mega program concept and 'mock ups'	25
Annex V: Timeline from February onwards.....	27

Full report of the Strategy and Results Framework and Mega Program Development Workshop

17-20 February 2009
Bioversity Headquarters

Introduction and Background

The first workshop organised by the Alliance in 2009 as part of the change process focused on the development of the new Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) and the mega-programmes (MPs) within it. It was attended by the Deputy Director Generals Research from the 15 centres, three Challenge Program leaders, external participants from collaborating institutions in the South and in the North, some Director Generals and members of the Consortium Planning Team (CPT) (see participant list in [Annex I](#)).

The objectives of the workshop were to clarify: (i) key concepts for developing the SRF and the MPs and (ii) the process which the Alliance will use to design the SRF and the MP by November 2009 in a transparent, consultative and effective manner. Ownership of the process, clarity among the key elements and a clear sense of what next steps are needed were the expected outputs. The CPT has been charged by the full Alliance to design a process for creating the Consortium and for designing the SRF and the MP. The outputs from this workshop will thus be inputs into the CPT's decisions. The intent is to have a draft SRF and portfolio of MPs to discuss with all participants in the Global Conference on Agricultural Research organised by GFAR in February 2010.

Kathy Sierra addressed the group via audio stressing:

- As we progress we need to be sure that we are opening up and looking to the future. It will be critical to have our partners with us in this. We need to build something that will inspire scientists and inspire donors.
- We want to secure more funding for a strong, results-oriented science. For this we need to have the right structure and management. The Alliance has the opportunity to keep structure and management light so that less efficient parts in the current system can be deconstructed
- There is a need to balance the coverage noting that as we look to the future we aren't starting from scratch but neither should we be constrained by the work we do today.

Kathy's address concluded with encouraging remarks on building on the momentum from the AGM in Maputo and to recognize the sense of urgency faced by the Alliance in coming up with a strong Strategy and Results Framework and Mega Programs.

Session: Drawing lessons from the past

The session, moderated by Anne-Marie Izac, comprised a panel of Jonathan Woolley, Paula Bramel and Rodomiro Ortiz, representing perspectives on the lessons learned

from collective action research in the CGIAR, namely through the Challenge Programs (CPs), the System-wide and Eco-regional Programs (SWEPs) and multi-centre initiatives.

What kind of evidence do we have that the SWEPs and CPs, by comparison with a standard program in a Centre, have created specific benefits in research, in partnerships and in effectiveness and cost saving?

- Past efforts in finding indicators of value addition have not been very successful. What seems evident is that the CGIAR has not been good in bring lessons into social learning and more effective learning systems need to be put in place. What is needed is explicit, purposeful and resourced learning systems.
- Partnerships have clearly added value to the research agenda:
 - Although benchmarking has not been done there is evidence that the CPs and the SWEPs have produced interesting and different partnerships. One example from the CPWF in the Mekong Delta shows that results went way beyond what was expected and successfully crossed the boundary between the water and food sector. Furthermore, SWEPs and CPs are one way of doing collaborative work. There is no evidence to say that these are better than what already exists in the Centre but that there is evidence that CPs and SWEPs have been important to individual centre research and partnership efforts.
 - Partners have gained training and capacity strengthening from working with SWEPs and CPs and have appreciated engaging with other African institutions who are partners in the collective action. The CPs and SWEPs have drawn in collaboration with many partners. As we continue we should build on this and ensure that we cultivate greater integration with regional and national agendas/priorities.
 - Doing new things involves extra people and extra links, which costs extra money. These are not transaction costs but investments in partnerships.
 - However...
 - Partnerships can be rent seeking or innovative; appropriate incentives are needed to avoid the rent seeking type
 - There are still questions on how partners engage effectively (have a voice that counts) and equitably (responsibilities are appropriately devolved; appropriately resourced).
 - European experience indicates that partnerships yield greater results when based on quality and examples from Europe would be useful to examine.

Evidence on the success of research has been noted in some of the SWEPs – recent CGIAR prizes to the Rice-Wheat Consortium and the Central Asia and the Caucuses for instance. There is evidence that the SWEP on genetic resources was instrumental in securing funds for the projects Global Public Goods 1 and 2. What has not been as successful is doing blue sky/new ideas research within the framework of the CPs.

Does the scale of operations have a direct impact on management? Is size a problem e.g. the bigger it is the more management problems it has? What lessons have we drawn from SWEPs and CPs that would enable us to determine if scale of operation is directly related to management problems?

- It was generally agreed that complexity increases with size (increases in money, partners, sites, communication) if we have not put in place the appropriate rules and mechanisms.
- Management increases as complexity increases. Moreover as complexity increases quantitatively (e.g. number of transactions) so does the ability to manage quality partnerships. Transaction costs are a result of poor design
- There has been a higher level of complexity with CPs whereas the SWEPs have been less complex managerially.
- Lessons for the future...
 - Collective action works when there are clear and enforceable agreements that are linked to real consequences to all parties
 - Need simpler ways of communicating and reporting
 - Need to challenge institutional walls and that not everything has to be handled at one level – devolvement – subsidiary principle
 - There has been a degree of self interest in our past collective undertakings and this has caused many of the problems; we have to put more genuine effort on strengthening the collective mind set.

Are there any lessons that can be drawn on the respective impacts on the ground of the thematic versus the geographical/eco-regional collaboration efforts?

- In brief, it was concluded that both are valid and benefits have been shown from translating results on one theme from one continent to another. However, history shows that both approaches work.

A session on *drawing lessons* from our past and on-going collective action mechanisms (the challenge programmes and the system wide and eco regional programmes) yielded the following insights:

- Partnerships have clearly added value to our agenda, viz., more integrative science and approaches, greater development impact and relevance and building of social capital (capacity building)
- We are not very good at learning from the past and need to put in place more effective learning systems
- partnerships can be rent seeking or innovative; appropriate incentives are needed to avoid the rent seeking type
- Complexity increases with size if we have not put in place the appropriate rules and mechanisms. Transaction costs are a result of poor design.
- Collective action works when there are clear and enforceable agreements that are linked to real consequences to all parties
- There has been a degree of self interest in our past collective undertakings and this has caused many of the problems; we have to put more genuine effort on strengthening the collective mind set.

Finally it was noted that there are many instances of things that have worked in the collective efforts and these provide good building blocks. As we move forward it will be beneficial to think increasingly of fluidity across the system – interfaces become less intimidating as a result.

Session: Aspirations

The next session explored the participants' aspirations for the new Consortium. The 'headlines' devised by the groups all indicated that there were high levels of achievement expected of the CGIAR by 2015. Examples of such 'headlines' included:

Headlines in 2015 (Examples)

Revolution in agricultural systems bears fruit

Using an example from a rainfed area in India demonstrating where local innovations and outside research has helped farmers to produce crops and save water. Research is driven by end users

One gigaton of carbon saved

How the CGIAR contributed to a post Kyoto agreement in which Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation led to resources for poor people dwelling near forests, reduced deforestation, and mitigated climate change

CGIAR awarded Nobel Peace Prize for developing wonder crops that beat worst drought in one century

250 million children don't go to bed hungry

While setting an aspirational tone for the rest of the sessions it was recognized that there are critical success factors and blockages to understand and deal with before the 'headlines' could become a reality. Critical success factors included:

- A value chain thinking approach
- Clear partnerships linking research outputs with delivery
- Thinking as a system; thinking out of the box
- Intended beneficiaries define the needs
- Political consensus and local decision making
- Strong national and sub-regional capacity
- Attracting, training and enabling top young scientists
- Critical mass in resources and personnel with coordinated and coherent investment
- Culture of innovation and entrepreneurship; strong leadership and management
- Functional global network

Session: Clarification of Impact Pathways

The discussion for this session was framed by Steve Hall who introduced the concept of impact pathways and impact 'trees'. The CGIAR has chosen three strategic objectives as its contribution to the global development agenda

In meeting the development challenges (noting that we cannot be responsible or accountable for direct impact at this high level) we need at least to think about what

the high level impact of our actions will be; what the dimensions/outcomes would be, and the investments and action required.

Working groups developed examples of a ‘driver tree’ or ‘impact pathway’, each working on one of the strategic objective (food for people, environment for people, and policy for people). This was an exercise in better understanding the complexity of innovation systems and ‘delivery’ mechanisms within these systems and the CGIAR’s direct and indirect role in these pathways or trees.

The impact pathways produced by the working groups (images available upon request to the Alliance Office) were very complex (‘spaghetti’ type of pathways), highlighting that the whole research for development cum innovation systems nexus is far from linear.

The main conclusions reached were:

- pathways are not linear but complex and ‘very messy’
- partners have to be involved in their construction
- research plays a relatively small role within a pathway, so that leveraging research with the other dimensions of the pathway is essential
- the three strategic objectives led to pathways that were very comparable; food, environment and policy are interrelated along a given pathway so the MPs will have to be linked to more than one strategic objective

Session: Partner’s Perspective

The essence of the presentation by Mark Holderness (GFAR) was that the CGIAR cannot work alone in delivering on development goals. From partners’ perspectives there are expectations of the CGIAR and what it can deliver. Some NARS appear to have a poor understanding of the value addition of the CGIAR to their own agenda. There are still some feelings of lack of ownership in the CGIAR’s program in their countries and a need for increasing dialogue on aspects of the research to development agenda. Across the partnership spectrum from NGOs to the private sector and to government officials a greater understanding of what and how the CGIAR can deliver and to what end is being sought.

The global conference on agricultural research for development (GCARD), being coordinated by GFAR, in partnership with the Alliance of CGIAR Centres, is one process to progress strategic global frameworks and international actions in agricultural research. Mark stressed that agriculture research for development must be a two way dialogue and conferences like this and the sub-regional consultations that will precede it open up the space for this dialogue to occur.

Session: Clarification of the concept of a portfolio of mega-programs and of mega programs

The session started with a presentation of hypotheses concerning the principles and criteria for the portfolio of MPs and for individual MPs. The working groups were

asked to refine the concept and definition of portfolio and MPs, using the hypotheses as a point of departure. The hypotheses concerned (i) the portfolio of MPs, (ii) integration of activities within a MP; (iii) impact and partnerships within a MP, and (iv) management mechanisms in a MP.

The hypotheses on the portfolio and on the MPs with comments made from both working groups and plenary discussions are included as [Annex II](#).

In addition, the following principles were proposed for a MP

- Focus on critical issues faced by the poor (major development challenges)
- It must be integrating
- It must work across different scales (temporal and spatial)
- Implemented and monitored with strategic partners
- Focus on a theme in which the CGIAR as a whole has a strategic comparative advantage. Most likely be led by a centre and not another entity
- Needs to have some clearly articulated target of success
- Contribute to scientific capacity building
- It must integrate gender issues

There was a general feeling that the name ‘mega program’ was not a good reflection of what is meant by this sort of scope of work. A change in name should be considered.

With plenary discussions building on the group work, the following areas of consensus were noted on *the portfolio of MPs*

- The portfolio addresses key development challenges facing the poor where the CGIAR has a comparative advantage. It shows the quantifiable outcomes and ultimate impacts which the Consortium can deliver by being co-accountable for outcomes (with its partners) and having co-responsibility for impacts (with a larger range of partners)
- It constitutes almost the entire agenda of the Consortium; activities outside of the portfolio would include new discovery work and activities that only concern one centre and take place outside of any MP. No precise proportion was agreed upon but a figure of 10-20% at Consortium level of activities for each was debated. Work on emergency issues will be part of the MPs and their delivery mechanisms.
- There are research ‘functions’ (e.g. labs, GIS, foresight studies) that would best be provided through shared facilities/platforms or outsourcing, to support all the MPs. These functions will be analysed as part of the consultancy on shared services and functions for which the Alliance is developing TORs.
- The MP portfolio constitutes a coherent agenda at the system level, integrating food, environment and policy issues in relation to the Millennium Development Goals; each MP is designed as part of the portfolio, with explicit linkages with other MPs, not in isolation of the other MPs. Gender issues and capacity building are also fully integrated in the portfolio.
- The portfolio reflects a different way to do business (a behavioural change) with strategic partnerships, integration of activities and a clear focus on results
- The full portfolio contains less than 10 MPs.
- A transition period from the current system to the time when all MPs are functional will take up to 3 years and has to be carefully managed

In terms of the MPs themselves, the following areas on consensus were noted:

- Agenda is driven by both by stakeholders needs and by science
- There should be a planning horizon of around 10 years, with milestones and an external/peer review process which determines whether it should continue/be amended
- Joint responsibilities (among all partners) have to be agreed upon
- Effective management mechanism, not an additional layer. In other words there should be no net gain in additional bureaucratic load for the System.
- Clarify roles of the centres with regard to the of the management of the MP

A consensus was also reached about the *principles a MP must fulfil*.

- Each MP addresses a big development/environmental challenge. It demonstrates how it contributes to quantified outcomes and impacts and provides measurable indicators of progress toward impact. Results and impacts are compelling. The roles and comparative advantages of the Consortium and its partners are clearly spelled out.
- It encompasses a range of strategic partnerships, identified on the basis of needs to deliver scientific results and impacts, given the respective comparative advantage of the Consortium and its partners
- Partners are fully engaged in the design of an MP, from the very beginning. There is alignment between the objectives of a MP and regional and national priorities. The design of an MP is driven by stakeholders' needs and the needs of science
- Activities within a MP are coherent and integrated. There are no redundancies as the work is planned, implemented and monitored in an integrated manner. There is a 'learning space' within each MP
- An MP has a clear impact pathway; it is accountable, with all partners, for results and outcomes and responsible, with a range of other actors, for the delivery systems leading to impacts.
- Realism in what the CGIAR and its partners can accomplish vis-à-vis big development/environmental challenges must be instilled in the compelling quantifiable measures of success the MP develops.
- An MP has a planning time horizon of about 10 years, with milestones along the way. External peer evaluations determine whether the MP should amend/continue/close its activities
- An MP has a simple and effective management mechanism; it is not a new structure/entity; at the Consortium level, it does not result in a net increase in bureaucracy
- An MP is implemented by integrated teams of scientists and partners; its management structure needs to be analysed by the Boston Consulting Group, as part of the Consortium creation, as the Consortium is accountable for the governance and coordination of the MPs
- The roles and functions of the centres vis-à-vis the MPs have to be clarified.

Additional points raised:

- Start differentiating between responsibility and accountability and the types of partnerships inside and outside of the MPs (remembering that the funds are for the research component)
- In developing the MPs, capacity building may have to be part of the research agenda to ensure there are delivery mechanisms for the research.

- Cannot assume that the entire impact pathway can be influenced by the System's 4% contribution as there are a large number of partners with their own agendas and programs. The challenge is for us to focus on what we can do with the 4% and not stretch ourselves as a System.

Session: Priority setting among the big development challenges and among potential Consortium Mega Programs

A discussion on priority setting among big development/environmental challenges, and among potential MPs within the portfolio, clarified that different criteria are going to be relevant going from the global level through to strategic choices of research activities within the MP portfolio. There will be several potential approaches to choose from and these will be pulled together in a way that is integrated and meaningful given the scope and scale of the different levels of priorities.

A valuable source of information is the report "[Visioning the Future](#)") of Working Group 1 to the Change Steering Team which laid out three strategic objectives and six themes within these strategic objectives with notional indicators. Another key document to the process is the paper prepared for the Alliance "[Towards Development Challenges for the CGIAR](#)" which identified the challenges that the Alliance of CGIAR Centres can best address.

The choice of MPs within the Consortium portfolio could be done on the basis of measurable criteria such as:

- Size of potential impacts, for instance: number of poor, impact on gender issues, impact on the environment
- Time frame to impact
- Comparative/collaborative advantage and alternate suppliers
- Feasibility/state of science to contribute and the probability of success
- Priorities of development partners and donors
- Coherence with the SRF and the other MPs in the portfolio

There are trade offs among the different impacts of a MP (e.g., impact on productivity and on the environment or on the poor) and there are trade offs among criteria (e.g., time frame to impact and state of science). The analysis leading to prioritisation will thus need to assess these trade offs. Because partners' perspectives and inputs are critical, the regional consultations GFAR is organising in 2009 will be critical and there is a need to link with this process. There are many documents (from the CGIAR and regional partners), processes (e.g., regional consultations) and tools (e.g., modelling) that need to be harnessed to effectively design a portfolio of MPs in a transparent manner.

Several participants noted that an evidence based approach to priority setting is important to include, so as to maximise impact potential. However, such an exercise requires investment in scientist participation and data analysis, so 2010 would be the earliest feasible timeframe. Thus, the role of such an exercise is probably best suited to inform resource allocation, rather than the selection of MPs.

Session: Potential portfolio of mega programs

The session was a first attempt to develop a list of concrete propositions for portfolios of mega programs for the system. The intent was to produce a few realistic but potential portfolios to use as the basis of conversations for ‘testing’ options both within the Alliance and with partners and donors. Continual ‘testing’ will be through modelling and analysis and consultation with partners. This ‘testing’ will also include an analysis of the potential portfolios in terms of the principles and criteria MPs and the portfolio of MPs must fulfil.

The task assigned to the groups was to develop examples of portfolios ([Annex III](#)) each with six mega-programs that would constitute the vast majority of the CGIAR’s work within five years. Note was made that gender issues in research needed to be explicitly addressed, as per a recommendation of the Independent External Review of the System.

Four working groups (MP Portfolio 1, 2, 3, 5) proposed portfolios in which the MPs addressed a big development/environmental challenge. In these four portfolios genetic resources; genomic resources; genetic assets; breeding either in combination or separately were highlighted as MPs as was diversification, intensification, increasing of agricultural production systems and NRM/healthy ecosystems. Three of the portfolios had mitigating and/or adapting to climate change in common and three had nutrition and health in common. Two of the portfolios specifically had a MP on value chains.

One working group (MP Portfolio 4) suggested a portfolio dealing with 8 rather than 6 MPs (rice-wheat, maize, roots and tubers, livestock, dry land crops, forests and trees, water, fisheries).

The fifth group (MP Portfolio 5) also proposed 8 MPs, with a mix of MPs – four linked to a sector/commodity (rice, wheat, maize, roots and tubers), 3 thematic MPs

- Better nutrition and income generation through enhanced animal production
- Sustaining water resources and eco-system services in natural and agricultural systems
- Resilient dry land systems

And one eco-regional MP

- Policies, institutions and people for agricultural development for SSA

The portfolios based along sectoral lines were presented as reflecting vertical integration, a simpler mode of organising research by comparison with today and a similar organisation as what is found in NARS and the private sector. It was also suggested that MPs organised by sector and target farming systems could also address crosscutting thematic goals, and that the overall Strategic Results Framework would then need to demonstrate how such individual MPs complement each other to ensure that development challenge goals are met.

Gender was considered by all the working groups with four advocating for mainstreaming gender research in all MPs (with two suggesting additional leadership at the Consortium level) and one MP suggesting gender and equity be one of the MPs in the portfolio.

Other cross-cutting issues were impact pathway analysis, strategic partnerships, capacity development, policy and markets. Other characteristics suggested included integration and regional differentiation (when appropriate).

The session concluded with the recognition of two approaches in identifying potential MP portfolios – one using a largely sectoral/commodity approach and the other a thematic/issue based approach. However, it was noted that this differentiation may arise because of different understandings of what is the scope and level appropriate for describing MPs.

Session: Next steps leading to the design of a process for developing the Strategy and Results Framework and the mega programs

This session focused on what needs to be done over the coming days and weeks in terms of tasks, working group(s), timing, milestones and ownership.

The key tasks were to develop draft Terms of Reference for the four key work streams coming out of the workshop in order to meet the overall time line for delivery (see [Annex V](#) for overall timeframe).

1. Focus and scope of MPs
2. Define the MP concept and the preparation of two contrasting ‘mock ups’ of MPs
3. Working-draft portfolio of MPs with prioritization criteria
4. Consultation and communication process

The intent was not to undertake any of the work streams but to lay out what would be required to accomplish the given task e.g. timeline; key inputs; key activities and deliverables; responsibilities and accountabilities, and interdependencies.

There was acknowledgement that a programmatic transition plan will have to be developed and that significant bi-directional interactions/dependencies, with GFAR / GCARD, the creation of the Consortium and the Fund have to be managed.

The work of the task groups would be used to inform the CPT. It is the CPT who has the charge of harmonizing the sets of draft TOR and selecting the individuals/groups to do the work.

Activity 1: Focus and Scope of the Mega programs

Going into the discussion there had been hopes that what was at issue was more about different levels of description of the MPs and that if the nomenclature was aligned this issue (thematic and sectoral or commodity based MPs) would be resolved. In the course of discussion it was determined that actually there were two distinct approaches for MPs. These could be described as thematic MPs (being the means to visualize what the Consortium does) and sectoral MPs (being the means of implementation and how the work is done).

- Thematic/Issue based MPs: The benefits of such an approach are that it would bring about greater integration; it clearly meets development aspirations, and would demonstrate meaningful reform of the research agenda in the System.
- Sector/Commodity MPs: The benefits of this approach were noted in terms of organizational simplicity, the relative ease of management especially during the transition phase as there would not be such significant changes over the current situation, and that it could be aspirational if it brought in different perspectives. It was also noted that this approach takes into account the way some of the national systems organise themselves.

There was acceptance of the idea of MPs must be integrative and that the goals had to link with development aspirations. It was agreed that some sort of matrix would result and that units of work might be done in a sectoral/centre way within a larger results framework that would help pull together the activities.

Where non-alignment between the approaches seemed evident was related to prioritization and balancing resources.

As pointed out the CGIAR plays a crucial, leadership role in doing research that meets development challenges; MPs with a productivity focus relate more to producing more with research than to doing business differently. On the other hand, MPs that address development challenges will, by their very nature, need research on commodities as an integral part of meeting that development challenge.

Next steps:

- Compare the models to the agreed principles for the mega-programs
- Create a mock up of a MP from each perspective as means to evaluate or pursue one option vs. the other
- This topic would benefit from select consultation with stakeholders

Activity 2: Definition of MPs and preparation of two contrasting ‘mock ups’ of MPs

Next steps were proposed for defining the MP concept and the preparation of two contrasting ‘mock ups’ of MPs. The results were presented for the consideration of the CPT for further development noting that the ‘mock ups’ would include details of how an MP would work (e.g. the high-level research agenda; the nature of involvement of research partners, implementation partners; the governance / structure, and the results framework; intended impacts, and outcome milestones (with reporting timeline) – see ([Annex IV](#)). Also considered was the layout of such a document.

Activity 3: Working draft portfolio of MPs and prioritization criteria

A further working group developed the following next steps for developing a working-draft portfolio of MPs so that by June we would have prioritization criteria and the evidence base that can be applied to discussion and decision on prioritization of candidate MPs and options for the MP portfolio.

Next Steps:

- Develop prioritization process
 - Key criteria (same for all MPs; may need analysis at sub-MP level)
 - NOTE: there are different prioritization levels ,among MPs and among portfolios of MPs; among Sub-MPs within each MP and among projects within each sub-MP
 - Analysis at the level of the portfolio of MPs (prioritization among MPs) is qualitative; to inform the Consortium with a quantitative analysis of MPs and among MPs spillovers is possible, a la IFPRI (+/- one year; USD 1 million)
- Present coherent MP portfolio (with perhaps alternative portfolios?) that is congruent with targets.
 - Based on the decision the CPT will make on the focus of mega programs, evaluate differences among alternative portfolios via decision points (e.g. how to handle NRM; integrate genetics or separate?)

Concurrently and in an iterative fashion would be the task to develop an articulation of the CGIAR strategy and CGIAR overall results framework. The group outlined the following in terms of preparing the first draft of the strategy and results framework.

- Identify key development objectives (expanding on the document of WG1 in the Change Management Process and the Alliance document on Development Challenges)
- Add quantitative targets to “Box 2” of the WG1 document

Activity 4: Consultation and Communication Process

A final group looked at a consultation and communication process in order that an appropriate, valid, transparent consultation process will be conducted between now and November, as well as an interactive communication plan to communicate progress and issues

Points made included:

- Communicate primarily for two reasons (a) to keep people informed and engaged in the process and (b) lay the ground work for consultation and outreach
- Link with the GFAR timeframe for regional consultation (H. Ting to provide)
- Review the ‘list’ of partners and stakeholders currently used by the SC and CGIAR Secretariat to determine (and if necessary add) targets for communication and consultation

Closing Remarks

Participants all expressed their own ‘takeaway’ message from this workshop. The meeting provided a vital first step in what was acknowledged as a difficult and challenging process. The working group sessions during the meeting had provided numerous opportunities for open and frank dialogue and in spite of the fact that full consensus had not been reached on some of the issues this was in fact, welcome and expected given the different perspectives people brought to the meeting.

What was evident was that the process of building the SRF and MPs will be hard work. There is a real urgency in what has to be accomplished in such a short timeframe. On the other hand, the meeting demonstrated an energy and commitment from the Centers to be engaged in this process and to work through the differences.

More face to face discussions such as in this workshop will be needed to resolve remaining differences; to keep up the focus on collaborative engagement and dialogue between ourselves and with our partners, and to remain engaged in moving forward.

This was echoed in the remarks made by Jonathan Wadsworth to the group in closing the meeting. He encouraged the Alliance to continue to move forward even if there is disagreement; to test ideas and to have open discussions as it is possible to get the job done in the tight timeline if all are working together. He emphasised the expectations of all the CGIAR members in the reform process and that there is a significant ‘prize’ for the Alliance in achieving success in building the Consortium and laying out a simpler and more effective research agenda that meets development challenges. The ‘prize’ is that the Alliance will be much more in control of the research agenda and not be subject to fragmented resource allocation from the donors. Finally Jonathan noted that with the many other changes arising from other organizational reforms (FAO, IFAD) and opportunities for agriculture in the global agenda, “the idea of reform has come” for the CGIAR.

For additional material, further information or any of the background documents prepared for the workshop please contact the Alliance Office
(f.chandler@cgiar.org)

Annex I – Participant List

Participant name	Group	Organization
Adekunle, Adewale	Challenge Program Leaders	FARA
Agumya, Aggrey	External Organisation	FARA
Allegri, Mario	External Organisation	FORAGRO
Anderson, Pamela	Consortium Planning Team	CIP
Atta-Krah, Kwesi	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	Bioversity
Berdegué, Julio	Consortium Planning Team	CIMMYT Board Chair
Bramel, Paula	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	IITA
Chandler, Fiona	Alliance Office	Alliance of CGIAR Centers
Chartres, Colin	Alliance Executive	IWMI
Dobermann, Achim	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	IRRI
Echeverria, Ruben	External Organisation	Science Council
Fan, Shenngen	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	IFPRI
Frison, Emile	Alliance Executive	Bioversity
Gryseels, Guido	Consortium Planning Team	Chair Alliance Board & ICARDA Board Chair
Hall, Steve	Consortium Planning Team	WorldFish
Hamdan, Ibrahim	External Organisation	AARENINA
Harding, Paul	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	Bioversity
Hoisington, David	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	ICRISAT
Holderness, Mark	External Organisation	GFAR
Hubert, Bernard	External Organisation	FI4ARD
Huijsman, Bram	External Organisation	ECART/EEIG
Hukmatullo Ahmedov	External Organisation	CACAARI
Izac, Anne-Marie	Consortium Planning Team	Alliance of CGIAR Centers
Jones, Monty	External Organisation	FARA
McDermott, John	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	ILRI
Montemayor, Raul	Externals	APAARI
Oliver, Jamie	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	WorldFish
Ortiz, Rodomiro	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	CIMMYT
Pachico, Doug	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	CIAT
Raitzer, David	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	CIFOR
Ribaut, Jean-Marcel	Challenge Program Leaders	Leader, Generation Challenge Program
Sere, Carlos	Alliance Executive	ILRI
Simons, Tony	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	World Agroforestry
Solh, Mahmoud	Alliance Executive	ICARDA
Ting, Howard	Consultant	CONSIDEA
Van Ginkel, Maarten	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	ICARDA
Wadsworth, Jonathan	Donors	DFID
Woolley, Jonathan	Challenge Program Leaders	CPWF
Wopereis, Marco	Alliance Deputy Executive (Research)	Africa Rice (WARDA)
Lewis, Tom	External Organisation	Organising Consultants (BCG)
Boyle, Colin	External Organisation	Organising Consultants (BCG)
McBride, Lane	External Organisation	Organising Consultants (BCG)
Ditzel, Cyrus	External Organisation	Organising Consultants (BCG)

Annex II: Comments arising the group work and plenary discussions on the hypotheses of mega program portfolio and mega programs

Hypotheses on the portfolio	Comments
<p>The portfolio of MPs constitutes nearly the entire research agenda of the Consortium. Current CPs and SWEPs become part of a MP. Whether activities are funded through the Fund or bilaterally, they are part of a MP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The portfolio of MP simplifies our current complicated research system (Centre programmes, CPs, SWEPs, Platforms,...) • There is one reporting back format for all activities, however they are funded, through a MP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least a minimum component to discovery work • Mostly all of the activities are in and includes both restricted and fund resources Organization of the science in the MP should be an opportunity to focus, structure and coordinate the research agenda. • Most, if not all, CGIAR activities should be in the MP portfolio. This should be an opportunity to simplify the agenda and reassess the IARCs and BOT mandate. • All Consortium work will be through the MPs but Centres will be doing some work outside of the MPs
<p>Portfolio is identified through: an analysis of the biggest challenges facing the poor where the CGIAR has a comparative advantage to achieve results. It reflects the contribution of the system to the global agricultural R4D agenda. It portrays what the system does in terms of development and environmental challenges and outcomes and measurable progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be science driven with strong linkage to development impacts. Learning space in the MPs. Good balance of different aspects e.g. downstream/upstream. Emphasis should be on what the CGIAR does best • Entry point needs to address development challenges eg. affordable food. However this is still too broad and needs to be more quantifiable e.g. what has been identified by CAADP. With this we can think about the MP might work • Should have audacious and challenging goals with clear impact pathways, be focussed, have space and time for innovation, mobilize...., add value and leverage new money and new partners • Starting point has to be well defined development challenge • Scope should not be defined by funding source • MPs are the Consortium's contribution to the development challenges – this is what we are accountable for
<p>The portfolio of MPs constitutes a much more coherent (less fragmented) agenda at the system level than what we have today. A MP is designed as part of the portfolio, with explicit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will cover food, environment and policy in an integrated fashion • Has to be platform for co-innovation – results focused • Transition from the current portfolio of

Hypotheses on the portfolio	Comments
research linkages with the other MPs, not in isolation of the other MPs	work to where the majority of the work is in the portfolio
The scale of impact of the portfolio of MPs is far greater than what we can currently achieve because of the strong focus on outcomes, impact pathways, coherence/defragmentation, the range of strategic partnerships and the sheer scale of aspirations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pitch at high level understood by policy makers with detail in sub-programs
A portfolio of 15 MP, or many MPs, would not be credible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number should be limited. Maximum of 10 • Will have to deal with complexity so will need time and capacity to adapt and innovate (15 years)
The portfolio of MPs can contain a mix of regional, global, thematic MPs, as long as the ensemble has an overall significance and value addition	
Trade offs between global challenges, regional activities to address these global challenges and cross-cutting activities (e.g., GIS, analytical work on priority setting) need to be carefully weighed and factored into the portfolio of MPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When there is a quantifiable outcome will be a needs driven approach considering all available knowledge, tools, providers. There will need to be a time horizon with an exit strategy for each MP which will depend on the nature of the MP.

Hypotheses on the integration of activities with a MP	Comments
All activities within a MP are coherent (not fragmented) and coordinated. The work is designed, planned, implemented and monitored in an integrated, systematic and rigorous manner; a MP is a means to end duplication and redundancies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive statement. Time for a centre to step forward and devolve from research activities if considered • Centres may need to get rid of existing themes
A MP has a focused, coherent and integrated research domain (it is NOT a cut and paste of a series of activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not automatic but there is still a lot that is there
A MP is compelling and powerful because it brings to bear on a significant challenge a more coherent and integrated research agenda than we now have	
A MP stimulates collaboration among the centres (appropriate incentives have to be put in place); it brings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include partners

Hypotheses on the integration of activities with a MP	Comments
together a critical mass of scientists and other experts, and it attracts very significant investment levels (+ 50m)	

Hypotheses about impact and partnerships within a MP	Comments
Each MP addresses a big development and environmental challenge. It clearly demonstrates how it generates outcomes and impacts and it provides measurable indicators of progress toward impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have a clearly defined research to impact pathway including the early stages of research; • MPs have evidence based plausible impact pathways
<p>A MP encompasses a range of strategic partnerships, identified on the basis of needs to deliver impact, given respective comparative advantages of the CGIAR and partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The respective responsibilities and accountabilities of all partners are clearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can only deliver impact with high quality research • Acknowledgement that there is a lot going on that the CGIAR will be accountable for some things and other partners will be responsible. The CGIAR is accountable for the MP but this notes that there has to be a lot of exchange between the MP and the other 97% of the ARD. The principle behind this is that it is a marriage of equals. • Quality not quantity of partnerships will matter and be careful not to have too many small partnerships that lead to fragmentation of research efforts
Partners are fully engaged in the design of a MP, from the very beginning. There is alignment between the objectives and outcomes of a MP and regional and national priorities. Stakeholders' needs are driving the design of a MP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding the right balance between partners demands and identification of researchable issues • Resources need to be shared with partners (30% threshold) • MPs are developed and implemented with partners
A MP is designed differently than a CP: to solve a significant development/environmental challenge, and to do so as part of a portfolio of MPs; it has clear objectives, goals, milestones related to this challenge and is not time bound.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have to be different than CPs. Time horizon of 10 years with defined milestones and indicators of progress. Provides discipline • Time dimension addressed through performance contracts and does not have to be defined per se
A MP is accountable for its results and outcomes and is responsible for the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand to a joint responsibility

Hypotheses about impact and partnerships within a MP	Comments
delivery systems leading to impacts (another difference with CPs). It reports progress in terms of agreed upon indicators, at the system level (not in a piece meal manner, centre by centre)	
Impact of research activities within a MP is multiplied through its clear focus, its integrated and cohesive approach and its systematic planning and implementation of partnerships for impact from beginning to end of the impact pathway	

Hypotheses about the management of MPs	Comments
A MP has a simple and effective management mechanism; it is not a new structure nor is it a new bureaucratic layer in the system. It is a lean, effective and flexible type of mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly appreciated • MP ownership with management: Should be bottom up and that the management structure should be flexible as per the MP nature. At the end of the day the CEO of the Consortium is responsible for the M&E and reports to Consortium Board on performance. • Could be a matrix with the institutions/peoples across one dimension with the science delivered through program management that contracts from the institutions/peoples • Need clear legal basis for management structures that avoids new governance structure • Need strong leadership and management • Consortium is accountable for MPs and their governance and coordination – implementation and management can take different forms and can be contracted to another entity. Will be different mechanisms for managing different MPs
Roles and functions of centres vis-à-vis MPs have to be clarified, including senior staff profiles (e.g., high calibre skills to manage complex processes on a large scale likely to be more important in future)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement that a centre will need to clarify roles and functions • Need improved corporate leadership to support MPs e.g. shared services like HR, finance etc. • MPs and their leaders need to be

Hypotheses about the management of MPs	Comments
	empowered via clear performance contracts

Additional issues raised for consideration were:

- How do we add or close MPs over time?
- How do we build flexibility into a MP, so that it can evolve over time?
- Is there a time horizon for a MP, does the concept make any sense at the level of a MP?
- Is a MP simply something bigger than anything we have today? Or is it a different way to work and collaborate?
- How do we prioritise among MPs?

Annex III: The of mega program portfolios produced by the working groups

MP Portfolio 1:

Preliminary discussions included important issues to bear in mind e.g. MPs can be integrated; they will done in partnerships; there must be tangible outcomes; gender could be separate or mainstreamed; would the portfolio be thematic or regional; it must be a coherent whole within the MPs and across the portfolio and encompass much of what we do already as well as new research.

On gender the conclusion was that it should be mainstreamed and part of all the MPs but with explicit 'affirmative action' (e.g. visible and active sub-programs, platform for community of practice)

Proposed portfolio:

1. Ensuring the availability of agricultural genetic assets for future generations (not only genetic resources in gene banks but also in-situ material).

Impact statement: 50% of current gene pool available in 2025 (Noting that we don't fully understand where we are today so there has to be research on the benchmark)

2. Mitigating against and adapting agricultural systems to climate change

Impact statement: xx gigatons of carbon sequestered and xx million farmers better off and xx million ha of forests saved

3. Diversification and intensification of agricultural systems to improve productivity and profitability for poor farmers.

Impact statement: In sub-Saharan Africa/Latin America/South and Southeast Asia) xx million farmers 'better off'. Food production increased by xx% (note this includes market chains and post harvest issues)

4. Improving diets and nutrition of world's poor.

Impact statement: xx % reduction in malnutrition of vulnerable people

5. Ensuring the long term variability and resilience of agricultural systems by sustaining the natural resource base.

Impact statement: Resilient agricultural systems that sustain growing urban and rural populations. Degradation halted and risks managed.

6. Improving water use throughout agricultural systems:

Impact statement: More produced per drop; reduced fund chain contamination; equitable access to water

Issues cutting across all the MPs in this portfolio were gender, innovation systems, policy, capacity development, delivery systems, and institutional issues. It was clarified that there was no discussion on relative size of each of these MPs or on their management. Furthermore, agriculture is used in the broadest sense (includes livestock, fish, forests)

MP Portfolio 2:

Cross cutting issues such as gender would be integrated in all MPs with a research and leadership function at the Consortium level. Capacity building would be an important part of each MP but there also would be research on capacity building at the Consortium level. The policy dimension could be part of each MP or maybe a function of the Consortium. There would be regional differentiation in thematic MPs when appropriate. The MPs would be integrative. There would be a need for sub-programs and space for different ideas and approaches as well as marketing of information coming from the research. Natural resources is meant to encompass water, soils, livestock, fish, forests

- 1. Improving rural community livelihoods through more resilient management of natural resources***
- 2. Sustainable intensification of diversified agricultural production system through improved value chains***
- 3. Varieties and breeds for tomorrow***
- 4. Nutritious and safe food for all***
- 5. Genetic and genomic resources and tools for today and tomorrow***
- 6. Enhanced livelihoods in Africa through R&D on delivery mechanisms (note that all MPs have delivery mechanisms but research on delivery mechanisms especially in Africa is warranted)***

One comment made in regards to this portfolio was the splitting of genetic resources and breeding given that the comparative advantage of the CG might to bring these together.

MP Portfolio 3:

The portfolio was designed using the following criteria as a checklist:

- MP should fit with the mission, vision of the CGIAR
- Should be results oriented and linked to a development challenge
- Comparative advantage (credibility legitimacy)
- Leverage capacity to mobilize resources and science
- Global
- Facilitated implementation

**Agriculture = crops, livestock, fish and trees*

The portfolio encompasses commodity, sectoral and eco-regional approaches and is comprised of the following six MPs

- 1. Ending world's hunger through increased agricultural* productivity***

Impact target: by 2020, 25% more agricultural productivity leads to halving hungry

2. *Safe, diversified, nutritious diets for healthy people*

Impact target: By 2020 richer diets reduces women's anaemia, under weight children and death by toxins

3. *Healthy ecosystems supporting sustainable agriculture and environmental services to improve livelihoods*

Impact target: By 2020 better management of natural resources (note: need to define quantitative indicators)

4. *Adaptation of, and mitigation, in agro-ecosystems to climate changes*

Impact target: By 2020 reduce GHG emissions from agriculture and deforestation by xx% and reduced vulnerability by xx% of exposed rural communities to climate variability

5. *Enhancing value chains to improve rural livelihoods*

Impact target: By 2020, increase amount and proportion of smallholders income

6. *Mainstreaming gender and equity issues across CGIAR portfolio*

Impact target: By 2020 institutional innovations applied to empower women in agriculture

Difficulties to note in creating this portfolio were:

- How to handle cross cutting issues: policy, gender, equity
- Criteria for priority setting across and within MPs (e.g. what to stop doing)
- Who are the 'we' in MPs? Actors, partners

Particular note was made of having gender as a distinct mega program as proposed in this portfolio; the proposal is for a MP which supports all the others And facilitates the mainstreaming of gender issues in all the other MPs.

MP Portfolio 4

This portfolio was based on thinking through the following points:

- How do you develop MPs that are actually going to deliver?
- The thinking among the NARS is often along sectoral lines (e.g. crop basis) and NARS are often the group being targeted.
- Genetics and breeding should not be separated
- More specificity is required in identifying the target groups
- Guiding principle is integration and collaboration within the MPs incorporating ex post and ex ante analysis

The portfolio was envisioned as comprising eight global food security and partnership programs that would enhance the livelihoods of poor people dependent on:

- 1. *Rice-wheat based systems***
- 2. *Maize-based systems***
- 3. *Roots and tubers based system***
- 4. *Dryland crops (cereals and legumes)/rangeland***
- 5. *Forest and trees***
- 6. *Livestock***

7. Fisheries and aquaculture

8. Better use of water

Impact statement: More than 200 million people can be reached; Nutritional status improved; Production, income, economic benefits increased

A simple statement to explain this portfolio: “Agricultural innovations to enhance livelihoods of the poor”

MP Portfolio 5

This group recognizes that there are many steps and analysis before selecting the portfolio and so presented two options to the group

Option 1: A combination of a commodity (4) and ecosystem based (4) MPs

- 1. Increasing and sustaining global rice productivity to benefit the poor***
- 2. Increasing and sustaining global wheat productivity to benefit the poor***
- 3. Increasing and sustaining global maize productivity to benefit the poor***
- 4. Increasing and sustaining global roots and tubers productivity to benefit the poor***

- 5. Better nutrition and income generation through enhanced animal production***
- 6. Sustaining water resources and eco-system services in natural and agricultural systems***
- 7. Resilient dry land systems***
- 8. Policies, institutions and people for agricultural development for SSA***

Gender, policy, climate change and the Challenge Programs would be integrated across the MPs. There would be relatively clearly defined roles that have clusters of 4-5 Centres in each MP with one Centre taking the lead.

The benefits of such an approach would be that it could be implemented within a year and already aligns with higher level policies at national levels and the management levels of Centres

Option 2: Thematic based

1. Sustainable intensification (major crops and animals)

Food availability for another 3 billion people will be available produced in a sustainable manner. This will address environmental concerns, post-harvest losses, policies, institutional changes, etc. Could be split by ecosystem or geographic regions

2. Reducing vulnerability for the poor through agriculture and NRM

Develop resilient production systems using diversity across land use (crop. Livestock, trees, water management, etc) targeted at the poor. This will include dealing with variability in livelihood systems. (Productive safety nets, insurance schemes, early warning systems.

3. Adaptation to climate change

Helping smallholders adapt agricultural systems to climate change

4. *Insuring genetic resources availability for perpetuity*

Researchers and communities will have access to germplasm, genetic resources for improvement of agriculture and direct use. This will build on the strength of the CGIAR in genebank related work and policy.

5. *Natural resources / ecosystem services*

This will enable the poor to benefit from environmental services through agriculture and NRM. Components will be forestry, water , soil management and the interface between agriculture and forestry. It will include valuation of ecosystem services of agriculture, policies and institutional arrangements conducive to insuring the poor access and benefit from these services.

6. *Pro poor Livestock/Fish*

In recognition of the potential of livestock/fish in addressing food security, poverty and health. It will include aspects of food safety, environmental impacts (methane, emerging diseases, etc the aim will be to help smallholders capture a greater part of the value chain (policies, technologies, markets, institutions)

Cross cutting dimensions: gender, impact pathway analysis, strategic partnerships, capacity development, policy and markets, health and nutrition

Annex IV: Timeline and proposed layout for mega program concept and ‘mock ups’

Timeline:

Before March 15

- Stabilize definitions of MPs
- Identify resource person and select chair of drafting team drafting team should comprise 3 ADE; 2 partners (note: will need to define the role of the resource person (facilitator, researcher, compiler, editor)
- determine if there should be one drafting team for each MP or one for both
- Identify large list of candidate MPs and decide on which two MPs to mock up. Need to include criteria for contrasting and types of contrast (e.g. core CG work (productivity) vs cross-cutting (Climate Change)
- Write up content as draft 0 using an agreed outline
- Circulate to ADE and key people (including 1 from SC) for feedback within 1 week
- Finalize distribution list for draft 0.1

March 15

- Circulate draft 0.1 widely (possible targets: ADE, AB, AE, GFAR network, Science Council, donors, private sector)

Late April

- ADE review of draft 0.1
- Revision
- Draft ‘mock ups’ and processes sent to ADE

Early May

- AE meeting to reviews draft 0.2

Late May

- Revisions to draft 0.2

June

- Submit to ExCo

Proposed layout:

1.0 Strategy Goals and objectives

- Impacts – possible outputs, indicative activities, impact indicators
- Locations
- Delivery plan

2.0 Partnerships

- Who, roles and responsibilities
- Roles for resource allocation (important to specify)
 - Accountable partners who are part of performance contract and get funding from MP
 - Responsible partners who agree to contribute to impacts but fund themselves

3.0 Governance/mgt

- Reporting lines for key staff
- Selection process for MP leader
- Development process for annual work plan

4.0 Relationships

- Role of bilateral funding in MP (outside of performance contract)

5.0 Results Framework

- Key input to performance contract
- Indicators and monitoring mechanisms

Annex V: Timeline from February onwards

	Charter the path forward	Develop draft proposal	Achieve Alliance	Achieve ExCo go-ahead	Revise working	Achieve approval
Objective	Create & charter working team(s)	Develop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •MP concept statement •MP "mock up" •Draft MP portfolio •CG strategy & CG results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Achieve Alliance green light to draft proposal •Get input on changes •Develop plan for ExCo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Achieve ExCo green light on work so far and path forward •Get input on changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Refine and add detail to working proposal 	Gain approval to proposal
Timing	Now				June-Nov	Nov. ExCo (w/ Alliance prior)
Owner	CPT	By May	May Alliance meetings Team TBD	June ExCo Alliance Idrship / Team TBD	Team TBD	Team TBD then Alliance Idrship
Inputs	Workshop input	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Internal (eg, WG1) and external (eg, country plans) document review •Analysis •Prelim consult w/ partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Draft proposal •CPT guidance •ADE guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Revised draft proposal coming out of Alliance meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Revised draft proposal coming out of ExCo •Regional consultations •Additional stakeholder guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •"Final" draft proposal •Numerous pre-meetings/ "negotiations"