

CCAFS
2nd INDEPENDENT SCIENCE PANEL MEETING

3-4 May, 2012
Copenhagen, Denmark

MINUTES

Participants: Thomas Rosswall (Chair)
Thierry Lebel
Takeshi Horie
Rik Leemans (*ex officio*)
Holger Meinke
Lisa Schipper (*ex officio*)
Mary Scholes (Vice-Chair)
Lindiwe Majele Sibanda
Ram Badan Singh
Christof Walter
Bruce Campbell (Program Director) (*ex officio*)

Apologies: Fatima Denton
Ariel Dinar

Invited participants: Niels Elers Koch (University of Copenhagen) (for welcome)
Svend Christensen (University of Copenhagen) (for pre-dinner presentation and dinner)
Andy Jarvis (Theme 1) (for agenda items 1-12)
Jim Hansen (Theme 2) (for agenda items 1-12)
Eva “Lini” Wollenberg (Theme 3) (for agenda items 1-12)
Patti Kristjanson (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-12)
Philip K. Thornton (Theme 4) (for agenda items 1-12)
Pramod Aggarwal (South Asia) (for agenda items 1-12)
James Kinyangi (East Africa) (for agenda items 1-12)
Robert Zougmore (West Africa) (for agenda items 1-12)
Torben Timmermann, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (Secretary) (for agenda items 1-16)
Sonja Vermeulen, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-12)
Gloria Rengifo, CCAFS Coordinating Unit (for agenda items 1-12)

Welcome by the Acting Dean of the Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen, Niels Elers Koch

Niels Elers Koch welcomed all participants to Copenhagen. He gave a brief presentation of the University of Copenhagen emphasizing the reform process and how CCAFS fits into the new structure. He also underlined the mutual benefits for University of Copenhagen and CCAFS of having key parts of the Coordinating Unit based at the University.

1) Welcome by the Chair, announcements and CCAFS carbon footprint initiative

The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed the participants and noted the apologies. Torben Timmermann provided practical information about lunch, check out etc. He also introduced the CCAFS carbon footprint initiative. Christof Walter gave a brief presentation on farming and food chains.

Decisions:

- To note the carbon footprint initiative.
- To request that the CO₂ emissions of the Coordinating Unit in 2011 be noted in the CCAFS Annual Report 2011 in a paragraph close to the financial statement.
- To request that the initiative be described on the CCAFS website.

2) Introduction of ISP, PMC and Coordinating Unit participants

ISP, PMC and Coordinating Unit participants briefly introduced themselves.

3) Agenda, minutes and matters arising

3.1 Adoption of agenda

The Chair invited the members to review the agenda and suggest any additional issues that might be discussed under agenda item #16 Any other business. The Chair noted the widespread use of abbreviations in the material and pointed to the enclosed list of acronyms and abbreviations. He noted that the list was not complete and requested that the acronyms and abbreviations be spelt out more widely in the Annotated Agenda for future meetings while still keeping the list.

The Chair asked that CCAFS ISP members voluntarily and openly declare any conflict of interest and that in such cases they would be excused from the particular discussion. The Chair noted that in some cases CCAFS activities would result in partnership with the institutions from which ISP members come. To be transparent on the current cases, it was noted that the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (Lindiwe Sibanda is CEO) has been a partner with CCAFS from its start, involved in the preparation of case studies for Theme 4, and involved with the African regions and Coordinating Unit on networking related to UNFCCC. More recently (in late 2011), there was an open call for work in Theme 1 and the Stockholm Environment Institute bid was selected after a rigorous selection procedure, and Lisa Schipper is part of that team.

Decision:

- To adopt the agenda.

3.2 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

The Chair noted that the minutes had been approved following an email consultation with the ISP in the weeks after the 1st ISP meeting. The minutes had been placed on the CCAFS website.

The Program Director elaborated on the matters arising:

Annual timeline for the CCAFS ISP

According to the annual timeline for the CCAFS ISP there was supposed to be a report on monitoring indicators at this meeting. What the CGIAR Consortium had proposed in terms of monitoring CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) was captured in the annual report to the Consortium under agenda item #5 below. However, this format had been approved only for 2011 reporting as further feedback is expected from the CGIAR Fund Council. In addition to what is in the annual report, there will be indicators to assess the progress in implementing the gender strategy. Closure on this is expected in the second half of 2012 and thereafter CCAFS will implement the required system. The ISP should reflect on the adequacy of the indicators, for its purposes, at its third meeting.

Meeting #1, Item 6: Strategic directions

The CCAFS Program Director met with the CRP6 Director in April to discuss collaboration between CCAFS and CRP6 (Forests, Trees and Agroforestry). CIFOR, the Lead Center of CRP6, is an active contributor to CCAFS. There will be joint activities at Rio+20 and in Qatar UNFCCC COP18. CIFOR scientists contributed to a submission to SBSTA by CCAFS and are contributing to various Theme 3 activities.

Meeting #1, Item 10: Business plan and budget 2012

The proposed capital investments by Centers were questioned at the last ISP meeting. The Coordinating Unit followed up with Centers with large amounts allocated to capital investments. Final 2012 Center budgets, based on the new budget allocation for 2012, were completed in April, and proposed budget allocations to capital equipment will need to be justified by Centers and ratified by the CCAFS Program Management Committee (PMC).

Meeting #1, Item 12: Forthcoming governance and management review

A governance and management review of CCAFS was originally scheduled to take place after 18 months of the start of the implementation of CCAFS, i.e. in the middle of 2012. However, in order to get a better understanding of what the CCAFS performance has been the CGIAR Consortium Board and Fund Council agreed to a later start – in January 2013. The proposal for input for the governance and management review that was agreed by the CCAFS ISP at its meeting in Cali in November 2011 would be tabled at the May CIAT Board meeting.

CGIAR and ESSP developments

As was minuted from the 1st ISP meeting the international global change research programs, and as a

consequence the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP), are undergoing a significant transformation and will be part of a new 10-year initiative: Future Earth – Research for global sustainability. ESSP will formally be merged into Future Earth by the end of 2012 and it is expected that ‘Future Earth’ will take over the ESSP responsibilities as co-sponsor of CCAFS. CCAFS, through its Chair, is actively engaged in the discussions to ensure that it will be appropriately recognized in the restructuring. Also, the funders of “Future Earth” will have a specific call for food security in 2013, which could be potentially important for CCAFS. The Chair and Program Director are engaged with the funding agencies to assist in the formulation of a call for funding (perhaps around 20 million Euros).

Following the Program Director’s report Rik Leemans gave a presentation on “The Future of the Earth System partnership and Future Earth”.

The Program Director further noted that the CGIAR reform continues but has been hampered by the lack of a CEO in the past months. CCAFS has many interactions with the Consortium – Board Chair, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Science Officer and Communications Director. CCAFS has received good support to its requests and has in turn provided inputs when called to do so. Interactions have revolved around budget, annual reporting formats, the CCAFS logo, establishing a global information system, establishing an intranet, and various joint communication efforts. The Chair attended a ceremony in Paris at which time the Consortium was finally legally recognized as an international organization.

Decisions:

- To note that the minutes from the 1st meeting have been approved by the ISP via email consultation.
- To note the slow progress on devising monitoring indicators for CCAFS implementation assessment, given the deliberations at the Consortium and Fund Council, but to ask that the Program Director present the proposed system at the 3rd ISP meeting.
- To note the ESSP developments and to request the Program Director to have follow-up discussions with “Future Earth” as soon as the new structure is finalized and to ensure a continued *ex officio* presence on the ISP.
- To have an in-depth discussion on partnerships with the view towards the development of a cohesive strategy in a wider context at the 3rd ISP meeting.

4) Chair’s report from the CIAT Board of Trustees meeting in November

The Chair reported that the Chair and Program Director attended the 64th CIAT Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting. The Program Director gave an update on CCAFS and the ISP Chair reported to the BoT in relation to ISP Terms of Reference, the Business Plan and Budget for 2012 and the recommendation by the ISP that two new regions should be added to the portfolio and the Indo-Gangetic Plains should be extended to South Asia. The BoT approved the ToR with deletion of the bullet “To deliberate on how effective CCAFS is in achieving its outcome and

impact goals". The final ISP ToR are enclosed as Annex 1. In the discussion on regional expansion, it was clarified that if there is a lack of funding for research in the new regions, a major review of the program should be performed so as to decide on priorities. The Business Plan and budget for 2012 were approved and it was noted that the approved CCAFS budget is higher than the approved CIAT institutional budget.

Decision:

- To note that the CIAT Board of Trustees has approved the ISP Terms of Reference (Annex 1), the addition of South East Asia and Latin America as two additional CCAFS regions and the Indo-Gangetic Plains be expanded to South Asia), and the CCAFS Business Plan and budget for 2012.

5) Annual report 2011

The Program Director elaborated on the annual report for 2011. In its first year, CCAFS got off to a strong start, releasing high-profile scientific results and contributing to the achievement (with multiple partners) of a significant outcome in relation to the global climate negotiations. Examples of major research and engagement results include: the Analogue Tool, which identifies and maps sites with statistically similar climates across space and time (as a novel means of supporting climate and crop models with on-the-ground, farmer-led empirical testing); a high-level consultation and case-study analysis with global food security decision-makers on opportunities for more timely food security interventions in Ethiopia in response to climatic shocks; a partnership for research on a GHG protocol for smallholders among five Centers and key global partners; and a tool and report that identifies hotspots of agricultural vulnerability to climate change, which can be used for targeting and prioritization.

The major challenge was the uncertainty of funding (in combination with late signing of contracts), which resulted in some Centers being unwilling to pre-fund activities, reporting a slow start and having significant under-spending. Another issue was that many procedures and tools for cross-Center collaboration were not available (intranet sites, reporting formats, common definitions of 'outputs', 'milestones' etc). As noted above CCAFS went through a priority setting exercise in 2011 to identify two further regions that will be added in late 2012.

The major research and engagement activities in 2011 have been written up for the CCAFS Annual Report which will appear shortly.

Decision:

- To congratulate the CCAFS team on the considerable progress made in 2011 in spite of the slow start and lack of clarity on funding throughout the year.

6) Program Director's report on progress

The Program Director explained that the situation seems to be much improved in 2012, with a budget figure informally communicated by the Consortium Office in January and confirmed in March.

Centers received informal notification of their budgets in mid February and a formal letter from CIAT in March stating the budget they can expect for 2012. Thus, hopefully all the elements are in place for implementation at a much faster pace in 2012 than in 2011.

The key issue on the budget is how to maintain the Window 1/2 budget at the current level and to grow the bilateral proportion of the budget. A major effort is needed to reach out to donors. For the Windows 1/2 funders this is largely through partnership on joint initiatives (e.g. Agriculture and Rural Development Day). In this regard CCAFS has a close partnership with the World Bank on global engagement and in South Asia, and CCAFS has made significant partnership efforts in Denmark, Canada and Japan. CCAFS will put in place in 2012 incentive systems to ensure that Centers, Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders raise bilateral funds.

The Coordinating Unit conducted and/or participated in the organization of a number of high-profile events in 2011 (UNFCCC SBSTA, Durban COP17, The Hague food security conference, Wageningen science meeting on climate-smart agriculture, various Commission events) and have planned similar kinds of events for the next 12 months. CCAFS has the aspiration to be the global “go to” place for research on climate change, agriculture and food security. It is the belief that CCAFS is well along that trajectory. Thus in 2012 CCAFS will shift the emphasis slightly to doing more work in support of regional research and engagement activities, as it is clear that regional programs have much work to do in order to become the regional “go to” places. In this regard, CCAFS will be highlighting the regional activities in global meetings (e.g. at the Climate-Smart Agriculture Partnership meeting in Vietnam in September CCAFS will highlight South Asia activity) and the Coordinating Unit will support regional-led meetings (e.g. Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI) in Bangkok in April). Discussion on regional programs was deferred to agenda item #10 but one of the main questions was how these can become hubs of research and engagement that makes them regional “go to” places.

Given the slow start, getting “Outcomes” in the first year is unrealistic. Outcomes reported by Centers were disappointing, as was to be expected. Nonetheless, some significant achievements were recorded, most notably the inclusion of “agriculture” in the Durban Agreement from COP17 (the result of work by many organizations). Some research fed into National Communications under the UNFCCC (as reported by IWMI). A key issue is how to ensure that Centers keep a focus on producing the Outcomes that are laid out in the CCAFS Program Plan.

Many publications were produced in 2011. This included publications in high profile journals (65) and a significant book by Earthscan. The Coordinating Unit produced 4 policy briefs (peer reviewed), 3 CCAFS reports (peer reviewed), 12 CCAFS Working Papers (not peer reviewed) and 121 miscellaneous reports (usually PDF files, including baseline site reports, workshop reports, project reports and synthesis reports). In addition to this, there were other publications that had substantial input from the CCAFS staff but which appeared under titles from other agencies/authors (for instance CCAFS made a major input to the policy brief appearing from New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)/South Africa Ministry of Agriculture). Four outstanding issues were identified:

(a) Productivity is uneven. For example, Bioversity with a large budget share have very few journal publications. The question arises as to whether the problem is sufficiently large that CCAFS needs to have a system in place to track the publication outputs of different program participants (in the face of needing to have criteria for many other equally important performance measures, e.g. degree to which outcomes are being achieved).

(b) Theme contribution to CCAFS published peer-reviewed publications is uneven and many CCAFS publications that are not peer-reviewed are being produced. Theme 3 dominates the outputs of peer-reviewed CCAFS policy briefs and reports. A further issue is that the CCAFS-produced publications are largely coming from Theme and Region Program Leaders and not from Center scientists. CCAFS is now trying to decide whether the current types of CCAFS publications is appropriate and the PMC sought the opinion of the ISP.

(c) While there are many worthwhile products, do they fit together into larger integrative products? After one year of operation, one would not expect synthesis across diverse Center activities, but there are systems in place to ensure integration, namely:

- i. The CCAFS Head of Research has, as part of her ToR, the production of synthesis products (and in 2011 she has led the production of two journal articles involving Theme and Region Program Leaders; and is in the process of developing a major integrative paper for *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*).
- ii. Theme Leaders, as part of their ToR, have the mandate to ensure integration and produce synthesis products across their themes, and to contribute to wider CCAFS integration and synthesis. In 2012 Theme 1 has allocated funds specifically to building synergies across Centers. Theme 2 is establishing communities of practice across Centers around some specific topics. Theme 3 has a cross-Center advisory group and has developed a couple of high-profile cross-Center activities. Theme 4 is working on gender-related issues with Center contact points for gender; and the IMPACT modeling group includes significant contributions from half a dozen Centers.
- iii. Regional Program Leaders, as part of their ToR, have the mandate to ensure integration and produce synthesis products across their regions.

(d) Many Center publications do not acknowledge CCAFS. The need to do so will be communicated to Centers (it is spelt out in Center contracts).

External communication and media activities in 2011 have helped communicate science results and positioned CCAFS as an expert source of knowledge in global agriculture-climate discussions. In 2011, external communications included targeted media outreach around several key studies. Together, these efforts have built recognition of the CGIAR and CCAFS brand. In addition, media coverage and targeted engagement related to the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change have elevated the issue of agriculture and food security in the climate change agenda.

The website has been an effective way to share research highlights and stories from ongoing work. In 2011 CCAFS produced 152 blog stories covering topics from all CCAFS research themes, and all three

target regions. Many stories were produced in collaboration with CGIAR Centers and other partners. Blog stories attracted 25,670 total unique visits from 204 countries. One of the main problems is that CCAFS is still finding that products produced by Theme and Regional Program Leaders are dominating the communications activities. This needs to change in 2012 with much more attention to Center activities.

In November 2011, the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change released their summary for policy makers, containing a landmark set of recommendations on Achieving Food Security in the Face of Climate Change. This was followed by an article “What Next for Agriculture after Durban?” published in Science, co-authored by many of the Commissioners. The Commission’s final report was launched on 28 March this year garnering significant media attention including interviews with many of the Commissioners, in countries such as United Kingdom, Turkey, Pakistan, Australia, U.S.A, Brazil and Spain, and in media such as BBC and New York Times editorial. The official press release was also posted on the official Rio+20 website. The animated video ‘How to feed the world in 2050: actions in a changing climate’, which illustrates the Commission’s ‘safe space’ concept, was disseminated widely and received nearly 5000 views in the three weeks after its release. As of 16 April, the final report has been downloaded nearly 13,000 times since its release on 28 March, and the Summary for Policy Makers has been downloaded nearly 14,500 times in three languages (English, French and Spanish) since its release on 16 November 2011. Commission outreach and engagement efforts will be sustained through to Rio+20 and beyond.

AgClim Letters, the monthly bulletin written by Sonja Vermeulen, is available in English and French. In 2011, nine editions of AgClim Letters were issued. The number of subscribers grew from 1651 in January to 4083 in December. AgClim letters reaches people in at least 124 countries. On average, 22% of messages in each campaign are opened, which is average for lists of this size. So far in 2012, three bulletins have been sent to over 5,100 people. The main task is to continue building and improving the subscriber list and continue to cross-promote via social media.

The CCAFS internal communications efforts have been enhanced thanks to the intranet collaboration platform, as well as continued production of the monthly internal e-bulletin from the Program Director. CCAFS has received favorable messages on internal communications, but there are still surprises on some activity being conducted by CCAFS that many people in the team have not heard of. The main task in 2012 is to make sure the intranet site works for all participants and to investigate further means of improving communications among Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders.

CCAFS conducted many research activities in 2012. Three key questions stand out for attention.

- (a) Are activities sufficiently integrated? This has been partly covered above.
- (b) Has sufficient attention been placed on having activities on the ground with farmers? The CCAFS strategy places plenty of emphasis on working with farmers to test and further develop technologies and practices, through participatory action research. While there are some notable examples of this occurring, we need to do a detailed assessment of the scope and depth of these activities. Examples include: Participatory farmer research assessment of how rainfall and yield

forecasts compared against actual recorded rainfall and crop yields for the 2011 season, in Kaffrine District, Senegal; Community Based Adaptation Planning and Costing: An integrated framework for agricultural adaptation prioritization and economic analysis using the Social Return on Investment (SROI) Framework; Development of climate-smart village concept in South Asia.

- (c) Will the research activities envisaged under the “gender and social differentiation” vision meet up to the targets that CCAFS has set?

Decisions:

- To note the continued good progress.
- To note with great satisfaction the final report from the Commission and to thank the Commissioners for their work.
- To request a presentation and discussion on the farmer participatory research being conducted throughout the program at a subsequent meeting to ensure an adequate level of investment in such activities.
- To urge that synthesis processes and products are sufficiently built into the program.
- To prepare guidelines for branding of publications and how to relate them to the logframe.
- To establish a searchable publications database.

7) Key CCAFS science issues

7.1 Gender strategy

Patti Kristjanson told the ISP that in early February, a revised CCAFS gender strategy was submitted to the Consortium, along with a two page response to reviewer suggestions (it was noted that while CCAFS refers to this as the “gender” strategy, in line with the Consortium Office, the PMC implicitly recognizes this as a gender and social differentiation strategy). Jacqui Ashby is now the gender advisor for the CGIAR Consortium. Before taking up that position, she was hired as a consultant to CCAFS to review CCAFS workplans as well the CGIAR’s overall gender strategy and guidelines for the CGIAR Research Program (CRP) gender strategies. Based on initial gender strategy ideas from Patti Kristjanson and in consultation with the other Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders, Jacqui Ashby drafted a comprehensive CCAFS strategy that then underwent several more iterations with inputs from the CCAFS team.

In the meantime the Consortium has come up with more guidelines, and Jacqui Ashby is looking at the February submitted strategy in light of the new suggested indicators, etc., so it is likely that CCAFS will receive one more round of suggestions from the CGIAR before finalizing.

Patti Kristjanson is now a member of a cross-CRP gender group and has proposed establishing ‘gender sentinel sites’. These will include some of the current CCAFS sites. As of early March, she shared this proposal and baseline and sentinel site sharing ideas with CRP1s, CRP2, CRP5 and CRP6 with very positive responses.

Decisions:

- To note the review of the CCAFS gender research and to tentatively approve the gender strategy, recognizing that there could be further suggestions for change from the Consortium.
- Highlight at a future meeting where and how the gender strategy influences the research agenda and contributes to desired outcomes.

7.2 Conceptual framework for adaptive capacity and climate readiness

Andy Jarvis introduced the agenda item. Adaptation is the key concept behind both Themes 1 and 2, yet the word can mean very different things depending on a range of different perspectives. It is therefore crucial that CCAFS is clear in its definitions of adaptation, and finds clarity on how to measure and demonstrate impact towards “adaptation”. Key concepts include: a) adaptation; b) adaptive capacity; c) resilience; d) vulnerability; and d) adaptation types: piecemeal, planned, structured, transformational.

It is particularly important for Theme 1 to identify practical, measurable and relevant indicators for measuring Theme 1 success, because of its focus on progressive climate change, where outcomes and impacts can only expected to be measured over long time frames. This is less of a problem for Theme 2 where the focus is on climate risks that are already apparent. Theme 1 indicators could be:

- # farming system and production technologies identified that provide demonstrable adaptation benefits
- % communities using local level adaptation planning to prioritize interventions
- # crop improvement strategies which explicitly consider climate change in their assignment of priorities
- # countries whose development plans consider climate change as a driver and explicitly identify climate resilient development options
- # countries/sectors with adaptation plans which explicitly identify high potential adaptation technologies.

Decisions:

- To underline the importance of complementing adaptation indicators with qualitative assessments.
- To link indicators to impact and impact to outcomes.
- To follow the international discussion on adaptation indicators and consider opportunities for additional CCAFS engagement.

8) Report on internal learning

The Program Director explained that the five actions proposed under internal learning at the 1st ISP meeting are listed below, with the follow-up activities described. In general, the CCAFS internal

learning activities follow those laid out in the program plan; all of these were completed in 2011 with the exception that only one not two ISP meetings were held, because it was the first year of the ISP.

1. For the Program Management Committee (PMC) to discuss and agree on the key likely success factors for CCAFS to achieve impact (e.g. team work within the PMC; exciting scientific agenda to stimulate Center and ESSP collaboration).

The PMC met in November with an external facilitator to look at what went well and what did not go well and to distil out the factors regarded as key in driving success or failure. In the end the PMC identified three clusters, around

- a. LEADERSHIP: how well the CCAFS PMC does at providing incentives for collaboration, good science and effective impact pathways – across our set of core partners, particularly the CG Centers.
 - b. PARTNERSHIPS: how well CCAFS PMC and core partners build and maintain partnerships (both research and non-research) that are credible and effective.
 - c. SCIENCE: how good CCAFS science products are (both in terms of stimulating interest and engagement with partners and Center scientists, and in being the building blocks of creating impact).
2. For the PMC to have an annual stock take on the success factors, externally facilitated in order to bring out difficult issues. At the meeting in November some of the annual stock-taking happened, but the prime aim was to derive the success factors. Before the annual meeting of Contact Points on 29-30 April 2012 the PMC did a formal self-assessment on the three success factors and at the Contact Point meeting solicited feedback from Center Contact Points. The PMC does a self-evaluation after each of its in-person meetings.
 3. For the PMC to undertake an annual risk analysis to identify high-risk issues and to put in place measures to counter the risks.

This has been done and is reported in the next agenda item.

4. For the Center/ISP to commission at least one external review per annum on key topics/outcomes/issues (this is likely to be linked into the “evaluation” strategy). The PMC will respond to the evaluation indicating how it will address the recommendations.

The proposed review on governance and management that was to take place in 2012 will be postponed to January 2013 – the ToR for this will be considered by the CIAT Board in May. The ISP will be asked to consider a programmatic-type review at its next meeting.

5. For the Program Director to organize annual 360 degrees feedback (provided by subordinates, peers, and supervisors) for Theme Leaders, Regional Program Leaders, Centers and Coordinating Unit.

360 degree reviews have been conducted for Theme Leaders, Regional Program Leaders, and staff in the Coordinating Unit. Center reviews and review of the Coordinating Unit were conducted prior to the meeting of Contact Points in April.

Decisions:

- To note the efforts made to ensure internal learning and requests that the following items be placed on the agenda for the next ISP meeting: (a) how we can ensure that knowledge leads to action; (b) presentation of the results of the self-assessment and Center feedback on the “Leadership”, “Partnerships” and “Science” success factors.
- To request a 3-year plan for external reviews with proposals for review in 2013.

9) Risk management

The Program Director informed the ISP that in November 2011 the PMC undertook a first risk management exercise to identify and prioritize the risks. These were then formalized in a risk catalogue and discussed at a PMC video meeting. The top five risks (those with high likelihood and high impact if they occur) are:

1. Funding uncertainty
2. Lack of capacity to attract donors to build up bilateral funding and/or Centers not allocating bilateral funds to CCAFS
3. Research carried out not aligned to the Program Plan
4. Low productivity, loss of creativity and lack of engagement by Centers
5. Inadequate planning and integration of research and financing across Themes/Regions/Centers

Subsequently a list of actions was proposed for the top five risks. For one of these risks the ISP is regarded as crucial in managing the risk – that is the risk related to the lack of alignment of research activities with the CCAFS Program Plan.

Decisions:

- To note the risk catalogue and proposed actions to mitigate risks.
- To initiate discussions with CIAT to integrate, where possible, the CCAFS risk catalogue and the CIAT risk catalogue and associated risk management processes.
- To put in place an issues risk management process that includes clarity on the risk owner, mechanism to raise issues etc.

10) Regional strategies and status on new regions

10.1 Regional research, engagement and communications strategies

Pramod Aggarwal introduced the agenda item and the Regional Program Leaders described the progress and challenges in the three CCAFS regions. Many elements of the regional strategies are similar: kinds of stakeholders, focus on participatory action research, policy analysis and communications; and capacity strengthening. However, a key challenge will be balancing the need to address regional priorities and having approaches that have sufficient similarities across regions so as to contribute case material to global public goods. An example of ensuring comparability across the regions is the gender work, where gender teams have been developed to cover similar issues and use similar methods.

The regional programs are designed to ensure integration among themes and across Centers. The former is now well advanced, but much work needs to be done on integrating some of the work of Centers. Approaches that will be used to ensure integration include the following: (a) the scenarios activities, but questions are still being asked as to whether this will indeed deliver the needed integration; and (b) the concept of climate-smart villages that aims to integrate participatory action research across the themes. One example of cross-Center work is the initiative in Bangladesh where WorldFish (CRP 1.3) works together with CRP5 on land and water (IWMI) and CCAFS for management of flood, cyclones and sea level rise related problems in agriculture.

Key questions to the ISP CCAFS included:

- a) Where should the balance lie between meeting regional priorities and ensuring global public goods?
- b) What mechanisms can be put in place to ensure integration of thematic activities in regions?
- c) What mechanisms can be put in place to ensure the integration of Center activities into a coherent regional program?
- d) To what degree can the scenarios activities play a key role in integration?

10.2 Status on new CCAFS regions

The Program Director described the situation and discussed the proposed selection of countries.

Decisions:

- To approve the regional engagement strategies and express appreciation for the considerable progress.
- To suggest that the PMC further consider the balance of regional priorities and global public goods.
- To welcome the approach with climate-smart villages and underline the importance of clearly documenting and carefully consider the up-scaling processes.
- To further consider the opportunities for private sector collaboration.

- To further consider strengthened collaboration with the development and disaster communities at the regional level.
- To further develop the integrated South-South learning products.
- To note that CCAFS will do the bulk of its activities in the target regions but will invest approximately 20% of its total budget in other regions.
- To note the status of the new CCAFS regions.

11) Engagement and communications plans for the coming 12 months

Sonja Vermeulen described the plans for major global activities for the coming 12 months.

Key events

UNFCCC SBSTA, Bonn, May 2012: Submission of views to SBSTA on agriculture. CCAFS organizes one side event together with World Bank and South African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) on “Gaps in understanding how agriculture can contribute to adaptation and mitigation” and co-leads the CGIAR booth together with the Consortium. Participation on invitation in other side events.

International Conference on Climate Adaptation “Climate Futures”, May 2012: Co-convened by the University of Arizona and UNEP. The conference focuses on adaptation to climate variability and change. CCAFS will participate with keynote speakers.

Rio +20, Rio de Janeiro, June 2012: Collaboration with partners on the following events:

- Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for Sustainable Development, 10-15 June. CCAFS session on food security co-convened by Thomas Rosswall and Lindiwe Sibanda. The session will provide perspectives from the science community and present the conclusion of the Commission report on Sustainable agriculture and climate change.
- 4th Agriculture and Rural Development Day (ARDD) on 18 June (morning). CCAFS is the lead organizer together with CGIAR, Technical Center for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) and FANRPAN. As in previous years together with around 20 organizations – e.g. World Bank, FAO, World Farmers Organization, World Food Programme. In addition strong links with key Brazilian stakeholders, incl. the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply. The forest component has been strengthened and CIFOR has joined the group of organizers. The key focus is on lessons in sustainable landscapes and livelihoods. ARDD will be done in close collaboration with a CGIAR event that will take place in the afternoon on the same day and at the same venue.
- CGIAR, half day on 18 June (afternoon). The CGIAR Consortium is coordinating an event on making “Agriculture, fisheries and forests cornerstones of green growth”. CCAFS is on the organizing committee.

Climate-Smart Agriculture Partnership, Hanoi, September 2012 and Sacramento, early 2013: The two major events are the Global Conference on Climate-Smart Agriculture in Hanoi in September, and the Global Science Conference on Climate-Smart Agriculture at the University of California at Davis in early 2013. CCAFS is involved in organizing the agenda of both of these and will aim to give high

profile to the Commission on Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change (in the Hanoi meeting) and the work of CCAFS Themes, Regions, Centers and partners (in both, but particularly the second science meeting). In the Hanoi meeting CCAFS will particularly focus attention on the South Asia program.

CTA-CCAFS Brussels Briefing, Brussels, September 2012: In an attempt to reach to policy makers and organizations in Brussels, i.e. aimed at the EU, CCAFS has involved itself with CTA in a so-called Brussels briefing. This is a CTA concept that reaches to the Brussels community and normally gathers 100-150 participants. The overall topic will be taking stock of SBSTA and Rio going into COP18.

Live streamed science seminars, autumn 2012: In 2012 CCAFS introduced a new concept with live streaming interesting CCAFS science done by CCAFS partners. The first two seminars were held in February (on climate models) and April (on pests and diseases). In the autumn the two sessions will be focusing on index-based insurance and mitigation in livestock. So far the two first seminars have had approximately 500 and 400 views, respectively.

UNFCCC COP18, Doha, November-December 2012: CCAFS will be leading an event together with the CGIAR Center on dry lands, ICARDA. The content will be defined in details after SBSTA and Rio+20. CCAFS will also be hosting a booth together with the CGIAR Consortium and will speak at events upon invitation.

Irish EU Presidency, April 2013: The Irish government that holds the Presidency in the first half of 2013 has approached CCAFS to lead a major climate change and food security conference with a strong focus on nutrition on their behalf. A working title is “Sustainably addressing hunger: the impacts of climate change on the nutritional status of poor households”. The overall purpose is to listen to practical experience from the field to inform high level decision making and practice in the fields of climate change and nutrition security.

Commission

Outreach by the Commission for Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Change: CCAFS is supporting Commissioners to attend key events to take forward selected strategic recommendations of the Commission.

Outputs

Nine issues of AgClim Letters: Key strategic topics for AgClim Letters in 2012 are: gender and climate change; decadal climate forecasts (covered in March 2012 bulletin); post-production segments of the food chain.

In the order of 8-10 new CCAFS reports and policy briefs and numerous working papers are being planned for the coming 12 months.

Branding

The CGIAR is in the process of adopting a new branding policy. This entails a large degree of uniformity of the branding of the CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs). As part of this CCAFS is in the process of negotiating a new CCAFS logo with the CGIAR Consortium but the final decision has not yet been taken by the Consortium.

Future of “Agriculture and Rural Development Day” (ARDD)

ARDD has been run for three years at each of the UNFCCC COP events, and will be run in a modified form at Rio+20. Many of the partners value it highly, it has given CCAFS high profile as a convener and it has helped facilitate outcomes in the UNFCCC. On the other hand it takes a good deal of resources (in time and budget, with an operational budget allocation of \$70,000 to \$100,000). It was discussed whether or not CCAFS should continue to convene ARDD in 2013 onwards, or potentially offering the “brand” to another organization to take up.

Decisions:

- To note the key engagement and communication plans for the coming 12 months.
- To urge the CCAFS Coordinating Unit to continue its leadership in organizing the ARDD and to look into solutions for the practical organization of the event.
- To note the finalization of the Commission report and to request targeted follow-up on some of the very specific proposed implementation actions.

12) Financial related matters 2011 and 2012

12.1 2011 year-end report

Gloria Rengifo outlined items 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.

While CCAFS had a total budget figure for 2011 from the approved program proposal, there was no 100% confirmation of the total amount until late in the year. It was only in August that CCAFS received the first 30% of the funds from the Fund Council while the bulk of the funds were received in December (58%). These were immediately disbursed to Centers and partners. The lack of timely cash flow and the lack of clarity about the total budget until late in the year resulted in significant under-spending in some Centers and a rush of activities late in the year.

Given that Centers, Theme Leaders and Regional Program Leaders had been given plenty of messages that their activities in 2011 had to be pre-financed, the PMC decided that Centers with unspent funds larger than 25% of their total budgets will only be allowed to carry forward 50% of their under spending. For 2012 year this percentage should be further reduced.

12.2 2012 budget

The finally allocated budget from the Consortium from Windows 1/2 (\$40.6 million) is significantly reduced from that in the CCAFS Program Plan as approved by the Fund Council (\$55 million). This required the CCAFS PMC to make various reallocations amongst Theme Leader/Regional Program

Leader/Center Activity Plans. These were communicated to the ISP in February for approval. Budget reallocations were based on two main criteria: degree of strategic fit of activities and percent of bilateral funds being raised. It is noted that the budget numbers sent to ISP for approval differed slightly from those presented to this meeting – as the Consortium allocated slightly more than what they first communicated and as there were additional funds to allocate because of under-spending in 2011.

It was noted that \$1.92 million of the 2012 budget remains unallocated. \$1.12 million of this is from savings made through cuts to Center Activity Plans and RPL/TL budgets and could be allocated immediately, while the remainder (\$0.8 million) results from additions promised to CCAFS due to different ways of dealing with the 2% systems tax. This remainder was promised to CCAFS in email exchanges, and CCAFS prefers not to allocate the funds until greater certainty is reached on these additional sums. It should further be noted that the European Commission has allocated funds to CCAFS but the contract for 2011 has yet to reach CCAFS. If there is progress on the 2011 funds then there will be an additional \$2.2 million Euros to allocate.

There are some issues that needed to be addressed. Most important were:

- Capital investment requests/policy: Final 2012 Center budgets were completed by the second week of April, and proposed budget allocations to capital equipment will need to be justified by Centers and ratified by the PMC.
- Indirect costs policy on some participating Centers has changed resulting this in an increase on their overhead line. The Consortium Office has not yet provided a common overhead policy for 2012 so in the interim participating Centers will apply their own overhead policies.
- In view of the clear evidence that there were variable methodologies employed when developing the CRP budgets, the Consortium has set homogenized budget and financial reporting templates across CRPs. CCAFS has adjusted its 2012 budget accordingly. Main differences with the former budget templates are 1) to distinguish between (a) CRP collaboration with CGIAR Centers and (b) collaboration with other partners 2) elimination of the Training and workshop line.

12.3 Financial update 2012

A brief summary on the 2012 Financing plan from the Consortium, and a cash-in cash-out report from the first quarter of the year was provided.

Some of the key items noted were:

- The CGIAR Consortium Office (CO) aims to disburse to Lead Centers on a quarterly basis, in advance, based on the approved funding level in the Financing plan.
- The CO will issue a disbursement plan for each CRP for the calendar year, so that lead centers can plan appropriately.

- The CO will require a quarterly cash flow forecast from each Lead Center for CRP Window 1/2 income and disbursements. The Lead Centers are expected to manage the funds flow to partners based on expenditure patterns.

Decisions:

- To recommend to the CIAT Board of Trustees to approve the CCAFS revised budget for 2012.
- To agree that the allocation of the various additional funds be based on strategic priorities and aimed to fill gaps and weaknesses in the current CCAFS research portfolio, and that the proposed allocation and justification be considered by the ISP through circulation.
- To note the rules applied to under-spending in 2011 and for 2012 under-spending to a maximum of 10% of Windows 1/2 funds will be allowed.

13) ISP members and their terms

The Chair outlined that the terms of five members of the ISP, including the Chair, end by the close of 2012. In order to stagger the process of replacement, two members should be extended for one year and thus step down at the end of 2013, and three would be extended for an additional two-year term until the end of 2014, as allowed by the governance arrangements. The Chair noted that a nominating committee of the ISP Chair, the Director General of CIAT and the ESSP *ex officio* member will propose a short list of candidates to replace members rotating off to the CIAT Board for their discussion and decision.

This was followed by a discussion on the issue of nominating an ISP Vice Chair which was initiated at the 1st ISP but no decision was made.

Decisions:

- To note the end of the current term for some members and the need for rotation in the composition of the ISP and request the Chair to inform the CIAT Director General that the members, whose term ends at the end of 2012, should be re-appointed for a term of one or two years.
- To appoint Mary Scholes as Vice-Chair for the remainder of her term as member of the ISP.

14) Future meetings, inc. date and place for the 3rd and 4th ISP meetings

The Chair noted that it had been decided to hold the 3rd ISP meeting in Bamako, Mali on 24-25 October 2012. However, due to the recent political turmoil in Mali, it was proposed that the meeting be held in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. It was proposed to hold the 4th ISP meeting on 6-7 May 2013 in Vietnam.

Decisions:

- To decide on Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso as the venue for the 3rd ISP meeting on 24-25 October 2012 and to organize a field trip the day before or after the meeting.

- To hold the 4th ISP meeting on 6-8 May 2013 in Vietnam, one and a half days for the ISP meeting, one and a half days for participation in the Annual CCAFS Science Meeting.
- To ask the Program Director that the ISP meeting in the first half of the year in future be held back to back with the Annual CCAFS Science Meeting.

15) ISP self-assessment form

The Vice-Chair presented the self-assessment form, which is based on the ISP Terms of Reference. As agreed in the annual timeline for the ISP the self-assessment form will be filled in at the ISP meeting in May and discussed at the ISP meeting in October.

It probes a member's level of satisfaction with the current performance of the ISP, compared with that member's expectation of desired ISP performance. At the end of each section, ISP members are asked to suggest actions the ISP could take to improve its performance in the area of that specific ISP responsibility. For future meetings the form will be sent to ISP members along with the documents for the meeting.

The ISP Vice-Chair will collate, summarize and analyze the results, with the assistance of the Coordinating Unit, for discussion at the next meeting.

Decisions:

- To approve the ISP self-assessment form.
- To finalize the form by the end of May 2012 and send to the Vice-Chair.
- To ask the Vice-Chair to present the results at the ISP meeting in October 2012.
- To ask the PMC to do an assessment of the ISP for future meetings.

16) Any other business

The ISP discussed the balance of time allocation for future meetings, how to ensure the proper science discussions, how to further involve members in defining the meeting agenda, reflections on the current meeting and how to secure ISP input and participation in the Annual CCAFS Science meetings.

Decisions:

- To express sincere appreciation to Jerry Nelson for his dedicated work in CCAFS during the past years.
- To agree that more time needs to be allocated to science discussions at future ISP meetings now that Theme and Region strategies have been presented and discussed.
- The PMC to identify key science topics for consideration of the ISP at future meetings.
- To request the Coordinating Unit to send ISP members a draft version of the agenda for their input.
- To include reflections on the current meeting and considerations about the next meeting on the ISP agenda for future meetings.

- 17) Closed meeting without management
- 18) Closed meeting without management and Chair

Thomas Rosswall
Chair

Bruce Campbell
Program Director

ANNEX 1

Terms of Reference CCAFS Independent Science Panel

The Independent Science Panel (ISP) of the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) is established to ensure independence of the programmatic directions of CCAFS. The ISP is accountable to, and appointed by, the CIAT Board of Trustees as the CGIAR Lead Center of CCAFS. The Lead Center has the right to review all decisions made in CCAFS in respect to potential legal, financial or reputational risks that such decisions may pose, and communicate its concerns through the appropriate channels.

The ISP has a Chair appointed by the CIAT Board, nine members, and three ex officio members (one from the CIAT Board, representing CIAT on behalf of the CGIAR, one representing the Earth System Science Partnership, ESSP and the Program Director). Ex officio members do not have voting rights. The ISP appoints one of its members as Vice-Chair.

The membership consists of internationally recognised scientists in the field of climate change and food security, as well as technical expertise drawn from civil society, development agencies and/or the private sector with a strong record of ensuring outcomes and impacts. Membership should be balanced in terms of disciplinary mix, gender and geographic diversity. The nomination process for ISP members will seek input from the ISP Chair and the *ex officio* members representing CGIAR and the ESSP, who will consult their constituencies.

Members are appointed for 3 years with possible reappointment for an additional period of up to 3 years to ensure a staggered rotation of members.

The ISP generally meets twice a year.

In order to ensure the independence of the programmatic directions, the responsibilities of the ISP are:

1. To set overall programmatic priorities.
2. To consider annual business plans as submitted by the Program Director and provide advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees
3. To review proposed annual budget allocation and provide advice to the CIAT Board of Trustees.
4. To approve the activity plan and budget of each Program Participant. The Chair and Program Director will consider changes to the annual activity plans; and consult with the ISP members if needed.
5. To recommend to the Lead Center, if required, a modification of a Program Participant Grant.

6. To recommend termination of a Program Participant Agreement (PPA) if the Program Participant is in breach of its responsibilities.
7. To develop a mechanism to ensure that the emerging results from *ex ante* analyses are leading to strategic allocation of resources.
8. To consider an annual report as submitted by the Program Director.
9. The ISP Chair will report annually to the CIAT Board of Trustees and liaise with the Director General as needed.
10. CGIAR and ESSP *ex officio* members will regularly update their constituencies on CCAFS progress, and alert them to any emerging opportunities or threats that are of significance.