



Consortium

**2017-2022 CGIAR Research Program
Portfolio (CRP2)
Final Guidance for Full Proposals**

19 December 2015

PREFACE

The CGIAR Consortium is issuing this 2nd call full proposals guidance document (Guidance)¹ as a successor step to the development and review of pre-proposals conducted between June and November 2015.

Portfolio design: This Guidance incorporates the CGIAR Research Program 2017 – 2022 (CRP 2) portfolio design that the CGIAR Fund Council considered in December 2015 and gave a “green light” to continue development to full proposals subject to certain caveats. Certain platform elements are also being called for as part of this Guidance. The caveats are set out in Annex 1 to this document. They form a critical additional element for consideration during the development of full proposals. When taken as a whole, the collective portfolio submitted in response to this call for full proposals must be accompanied by a summary of how each of the respective caveats have been addressed.

The CGIAR Fund Council has also requested that the Consortium prepare a portfolio/system level document to accompany the submission of the set of CRP full proposals for discussion and review at the Fund Council’s Fifteenth Meeting.²

Scope for review of this Guidance document: All stakeholders recognize the importance of issuing this Guidance in December 2015 to maintain momentum for a January 2017 start of implementation date. However, conversations planned in the first half of 2016 may have an impact on specific elements of this Guidance and/or the final format of full proposals considered by a CGIAR System Council at the end of 2016. These conversations include Center-led discussions on enhancing genetic gains in January 2016 and Fund Council deliberations on the uses of funding in May 2016. **In consultation with the Centers and Fund Council, the Consortium Board may therefore determine it appropriate to issue revisions to this Guidance subsequently.** Observations on the implementation of the Guidance can be made at any time to crp-proposals@cgiar.org

Submission of Full Proposals

- Proposals must be submitted through the on-line submission tool on www.CGIAR.org by **not later than 31 March 2016**. Late proposals will not be considered.
- To facilitate on time review, **proposals must adhere to the requirements and template length** set out indicatively in this Guidance in Annex 2, as enforced through the submission tool.

¹ The process for finalization and issue of this Guidance as approved by the Consortium Board at its Twenty-Third meeting on 14 December 2015.

² FC15 is planned for 2-6 May 2016. The Fund Council has requested that the document be in language accessible to a wide audience including non-scientists and potential new funders

Contents

1.	The call and the approval process	4
2.	The CGIAR Portfolio	8
2.1	The CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)	8
2.2	Flagship elements of the CRPs	11
2.3	Call for enabling platforms.....	13
2.4	How the new portfolio differs from phase I.	17
3.	Key elements of the call.....	19
3.1	Program descriptions, including Flagships, clusters of activities, cross cutting activities. ...	19
3.2	Site integration.....	20
3.3	Partnership strategy.....	21
3.4	Capacity development strategy	23
3.5	Gender strategy	25
3.6	Youth.....	26
3.7	Results Based Management and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Strategy	26
3.8	Intellectual asset management.....	31
3.9	Open Access and Open Data	32
3.10	Communication.....	33
3.11	Governance and Management	35
3.12	Budget, Financial management and reporting	37
4.	Proposal review and Approval Process.....	42
4.1	Criteria for Assessing Full Proposals	43
4.2	Criteria at CRP level.....	43
4.3	Criteria at Flagship level.....	45
4.4	Criteria for Platforms	46
5.	Proposal template.....	47
6.	Allocation of budgets to CRPs in phase II.....	47
Annex 1	Caveats to preparation of full proposals.....	49
Annex 2	Outline template of the CRP proposal format for phase II.	53
Annex 3	Outline templates for Budgets and Value for Money analysis	59

1. The call and the approval process

CGIAR is a global research partnership that is a leading provider of research and development in agriculture (including crops, livestock, aquaculture and forestry).

Our vision is a world free of poverty, hunger and environmental degradation.

Our mission is to advance agri-food science and innovation to enable poor people, especially poor women, to increase agricultural productivity and resilience; share in economic growth and feed themselves and their families better; and manage natural resources in the face of climate change and other threats.

CGIAR’s 2016 – 2030 Strategy and Results Framework (SRF)³ defines CGIAR’s aspirations and strategic actions to deliver on our mission.

Our SRF is ambitious: By 2030, the action of CGIAR and its partners will result in 150 million fewer hungry people, 100 million fewer poor people – at least 50% of whom are women, and 190 million ha less degraded land. CGIAR system entities plan to deliver on the SRF by focusing on three goals (System Level Outcomes or SLOs), and their respective underlying intermediate development outcomes (or IDOs), refer figure 1 below.

Figure 1: SRF system level and intermediate development outcomes



Implementation of the 2016-2030 SRF is planned in phases, with 2017-2022 representing the initial 6-year operational period. CGIAR plans to realize these shared outcomes through the creation of a comprehensive new portfolio of CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs) that build on successes to date, lessons learnt, and new science and technology that bring exciting opportunities.

With the SRF providing the overall strategic direction, research priorities and Results Framework⁴, this Guidance document (Guidance) sets out:

- The overarching framework and timetable for the 2nd Call for CRPs (CRP 2nd Call); and
- The specific requirements and assessment criteria for full proposals for phase II CRPs.

³ Approved by the CGIAR Consortium Board at its twentieth meeting (CB/B20/DP04). Find it here: [CGIAR 2016 - 2030 SRF](#).

⁴ This Guidance is subsidiary to the SRF, so that in case of differences, the SRF prevails.

Launching the 2nd call for Full Proposals for CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)

By not later than **31 March 2016**, the CGIAR Consortium invites the submission of:

- **A coherent set of 12 interconnected proposals** for the period **2017-2022** to address the selected global challenges identified in CGIAR's 2016 – 2030 SRF; and
- Three further proposals to develop CGIAR system-level platforms for: (i) **genebanks**; (ii) **genetic gains**; and (iii) **big data, information, and knowledge**, as integral strategic and service components of the portfolio over the same 6 year implementation period to strengthen the foundation for effective implementation of research and delivery of CGIAR outcomes.

Specifically, the 12 interconnected CRP2 Portfolio proposals submitted in response to this call:

- Should represent innovative programs of research that respond to the new CRP portfolio (CRP2 Portfolio) described in Chapter 2 (or as described in the final guidance);
- Should follow the format (content) set out in Chapter 3 of this Guidance document and conform with the format and length to be found in the on-line submission tool as outlined on a preliminary basis in Annex 2; and
- Will be assessed according to the criteria for the ISPC independent peer review of full proposals set out in Chapter 4.

Chapter 2 of this Guidance sets out the purpose of calling for three, similarly interconnected, platforms⁵, with Chapter 4 also providing criteria for review. Chapter 2 also discusses the possible funding approaches for a comprehensive, high quality big data, information and knowledge platform.

⁵ Drawing on lessons learned from the pre-proposal process, and after reconsideration of the potential gaps addressed by such a platform, this Guidance includes a revised, targeted call for a big data, information and knowledge platform.

The roadmap to final approval

To enhance the overall excellence and value for money of the CRP2 Portfolio, the CRP 2nd Call has been designed to proceed according to three key phases: (i) pre-proposals (*completed at the time of launch of this 2nd Call for Full Proposals, and not described below*); (ii) full proposals (this call); and (iii) getting down to work as set out in table 1 below.

Table 1: Timeline for the CRP 2nd Call for Full Proposals

Dec 2015 - Nov 2016	(ii) Full proposal stage and review for invited proposals
20 December	Consortium Board invites approved proposals to submit full proposals and initiates other follow-up actions
20 December 2015 – 31 March 2016	Centers prepare and submit full CRP II Portfolio proposals
6-8 April 2016	GCARD3 in South Africa (and national consultations during Q1 of 2016)
13 April 2016	Consortium prepared portfolio/system level document submitted for review at the Fund Council’s 15 th meeting (FC15)
1 April – 16 June 2016	ISPC pre-review of CRP full proposals, including site visits to Lead Centers or key regional and/or platform sites as needed.
2- 6 May 2016	FC15. Discussion on full proposals & accompanying Consortium prepared portfolio/ system level document
23 June 2016	ISPC-Consortium –Centers-donors meeting to discuss ISPC review
27 June – 31 July 2016	Centers revise proposals (and share with new CGIAR System Council)
1 August – 30 September 2016	ISPC Reviewing CRPs’ responses to ISPC comments
10 November 2016	CGIAR System Council decisions on CRP proposals and ISPC formal recommendation to the System Council
10 November – 10 December 2016	Center revisions of CGIAR System Council must-haves, if any
10 - 20 December 2016	ISPC final check of CGIAR System Council must haves
10 November - 31 December 2016	New CRP legal agreements put in place between CGIAR System Council and lead Centers
From Jan 2017	(iii) CRP II Portfolio implementation
Starts 1 January 2017	A rolling 6-year program of research with committed funding for the initial 3 years, renewable depending on progress.

As set out in table 2 below, the call anticipates that proposals for all elements of the portfolio (both programs and platforms, as described in Chapter 2) should be written for a base budget scenario for the portfolio (aligned with current ODA funding) of around USD900 million per annum.

Table 2: Indicative Budget Amounts for portfolio (CRPs and platforms) with W1 and W2 amounts and percentages for 2017⁶

		Projected shares under a \$900m indicative budget US\$ millions	% of Total \$900 million base budget	Projected W1 + W2 US\$ millions	Approx. % of total W1+W2
Agrifood systems CRPs	DCLAS	105	11.7	11.5	5.5
	Fish	26	2.9	8.5	4.1
	FTA	73.5	8.2	11	5.2
	Livestock	43.5	4.8	20	9.8
	Maize	68	7.5	12.5	6.1
	Rice	86	9.6	14.5	6.9
	RTB	114	12.7	22.5	10.7
	Wheat	43	4.8	15	7.1
Global integrating CRPs	A4NH	91	10.1	20	9.6
	CCAFS	57	6.3	21	10.1
	PIM	93	10.3	19	9.1
	WLE	59	6.5	10	4.5
Platforms	Genebanks ⁷	30	3.3	21.5	10.4
	Genetic Gains ⁸	10	1.1	2.0	1.0
	Big data	Refer footnote 9			
TOTAL		899	100.0	209	100.0

The call also allows for description of programs in a more optimistic – uplift- portfolio budget of up to USD1.35 billion, in which the additional outcomes for higher levels of funding should be described and thus allow further prioritization by investors towards desired outcomes as funding permits⁹.

⁶ Source: *Delivering on the CGIAR Strategic Results Framework with a refreshed and Prioritized Portfolio of Phase II CRPs* (CGIAR Centers' document of November 27 2015). Note that as this is an approximate proposed distribution, subject to proposal review, columns 1 and 3 in the above have been rounded to the nearest half million for indicative purposes only. The program titles are given and explained in outline in Chapter 2. The allocations in Table 2 are nominal and are not prioritized for 2017 and beyond. The levels shown in the table result from historical allocations of W2 funding to phase I CRPs plus a standard increment of 4 million W1 funding per CRP. The high relative amounts for two CRPs – DCLAS and RTB (greater than USD 100 million) result from phase I system CRP mergers. Actual funding may differ according to the quality of full proposals and the guidance of the Fund /System Council in 2016.

⁷ Genebanks funding was discussed at FC13, before definition of the new portfolio, and may benefit from further discussion during the FC15 discussions on the uses of W1-2 funds, with the new portfolio in mind.

⁸ Funding for the system-level service platforms may also need review after proposals have been evaluated. The funding for the genetic gain platform will be reviewed after the form of the initiative is discussed during a Center-led meeting in January 2016.

⁹ For instance, whether funding for a comprehensive platform on Big Data will be awarded in the base budget or in the uplift budget scenario will be assessed on the basis of the proposal received

2. The CGIAR Portfolio

2.1 The CGIAR Research Programs (CRPs)

To meet the challenges CGIAR has identified in its 2016 - 2030 SRF, CGIAR is proposing a portfolio of results-focused programs: **eight Agri-Food System programs**¹⁰ linked with **four global integrating programs** to create and enhance the enabling conditions for delivery of CGIAR research outcomes in terms of human welfare benefits (poverty and nutrition) and for the environment in the face of climate change. These programs are outlined below, with the major components (or Flagship programs, FPs), being further described in section 2.1.

Full proposals should identify a Lead Center based on science leadership, expertise and managerial capacity.

Dryland Cereals and Legumes Agri-food Systems program (DCLAS) is a multi-commodity Agri-food system program anchored in two classes of nutritious food crops and focusses primarily on Agri-food systems in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. The program aims to empower currently underperforming value chains through research that breeds reliable and marketable commodities, that provides risk management tools for all components of the value chain and can lead to investment in value chain services. It contributes directly to SLO 1 and 2 and to SLO 3 through its work on sustainable management practices for the target crops and systems.

Fish (as a commodity) provides around 3 billion people with 20% of their protein requirement. The **Fish Agri-food systems program** addresses research on the two major sources of fish supply - improvement of aquaculture and the sustainability of small scale fisheries. The program will pursue research that enables gains in livelihoods and nutritional benefits principally in Asia and Africa. It contributes directly to all 3 CGIAR SLOs.

The **Forests, trees and agro-forestry Agri-food systems program (FTA)** is a combined approach to forests and tree based systems that contribute to small holder livelihoods and to ecosystem services with activities relevant to seven of the SDG targets. It includes continuing research on forests and climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The **Livestock Agri-food systems program** addresses livestock as high value assets providing key nutrient-rich products and livelihoods, and which contribute to resilience and important environmental interactions (both positive and negative). These will be the subject of a more rounded program than in phase I, drawing on research components in genetics, health and feeds to enhance livestock value chains in three continents and provide equitable livelihood

¹⁰ An Agri-Food systems program focusses research on one or several commodities to produce comprehensive linkages from the exploitation of genetic diversity, breeding, farming and production systems, ecosystems and environmental impacts, through the use of the commodities and derived products to the measurement of development impacts (such as food and nutrition security and livelihoods) from these contributions to value chains and food systems.

opportunities for the poor. The greenhouse gas emissions from livestock raising will be addressed along with soil degradation as the environmental focus of the program.

Maize is a staple food for hundreds of millions of people in the developing world. The **Maize Agri-food systems program** seeks to ensure that technologies and approaches for sustainable and profitable intensification are targeted towards smallholders and developed and adopted by them, while drawing on the best innovations worldwide combining inputs from all relevant disciplines. Technologies include stress and climate resilient maize varieties along with new farm management and agronomic technologies, decision-making tools for crop production and marketing and opportunities for value addition. Enhanced nutrition can be derived from enhanced maize as well as from maize-based systems with an emphasis on nutritional quality.

Rice is a staple food for 4 billion people worldwide. The **Rice Agri-food systems program (RAFS)** aims to reduce poverty and hunger, improve human health and nutrition, and enhance the climate resilience of rice-based farming systems. In much of sub-Saharan Africa there is a need to improve access to improved small-scale technologies to increase productivity, stabilize yields and escape poverty. In Asia, the demands are dynamic as a result of structural transformation and there is the opportunity to contribute to the rice value chain and enhance opportunities for production, livelihoods and job creation.

The **Roots, Tubers and Bananas Agri-food systems program (RTB)** will bring together research on key vegetatively propagated staple crops (banana, cassava, potato, sweet potato, yam and minor roots and tubers). Important in their own right for millions of smallholders, they also complement cereals, legumes, agro-forestry and livestock systems. They offer opportunities to avoid food shortages, to contribute to the enhancement of diet quality and nutrition, profitability and income and the enhancement of cropping systems, including increased soil carbon.

The **Wheat Agri-food systems program** responds to the increasing demand for this staple in developing countries which is expected to grow by 34-60% by 2050. It seeks to improve varieties and wheat based systems with an emphasis on drought and heat tolerance and nutritional quality. Enhanced nutrition can be derived from enhanced wheat as well as from wheat-based systems with an emphasis on nutritional quality.

Agriculture for Nutrition and Health program (A4NH) responds to the global challenge of improving food security and human nutrition and health. The phase I program sought to increase the synergies between agriculture nutrition and health and in Phase II A4NH will provide knowledge and evidence for nutrition and health-sensitive agricultural solutions, develop and test technical and policy interventions for improved outcomes at scale. As a global integrating program, A4NH will have three important roles to play across the portfolio; (i) leveraging the breeding, production systems and value chain research in the AFS-CRPs for more comprehensive approaches to diet and nutrition; (ii) coordinating with

the integrating CRPs to align nutrition and health outcomes with broader agri-food and other policies; and (iii) convening relationships between CGIAR and global as well as regional nutrition and health communities. The program acts therefore as the CGIAR lens on the achievement of SLO 2.

Climate change is beginning to have consequences for agriculture and natural resources which will be far-reaching. Investment is required in the integration of food security and adaptation and mitigation approaches towards poor, agriculture-dependent women and men whose livelihoods are most at risk. The overall purpose of **Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security program (CCAFS)** is to marshal the science and expertise of CGIAR and partners to catalyze approaches to climate smart agriculture, food systems and landscapes. Whilst climate change is mainstreamed into all CRPs, CCAFS will act as the integrating program from farm to landscape levels to maximize CGIAR's contribution to this global challenge.

Returns to the CGIAR portfolio as a whole are affected by the quality of policies and institutions and the gender responsiveness of program design and implementation. The **Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM)** program provides targeted analysis to strengthen the evidence on which to base better agricultural and food policies, stronger rural institutions, and well-functioning markets serving agriculture and food systems. These are all elements of the enabling environment through which social and environmental outcomes will be derived from CGIAR research. As part of its research PIM, as an integrating program, will contribute to CGIAR work on foresight, to value chains and will provide the focus for CGIAR's consolidated approach to gender and gender research.

The Water, Land and Ecosystems program (WLE) contributes directly to SLO 3 (and six of the SDGs) by taking a medium to long-term perspective to ensuring that growth, poverty reduction and food security objectives are supported by efficiency gains and are not compromised by broader landscape level constraints resulting from the degradation of natural resources and agro-ecosystems. It will work on the regeneration of degraded landscapes and soil and water solutions for sustainable intensification. This latter focus will link the farm-level research of the agrifood systems programs to landscape level management in specific localities in Africa and in Asia.

2.2 Flagship elements of the CRPs

Table 3 lists the major components of the CRPs (as described in section 2.1), and includes an approximate anticipated distribution of W1-W2 funding at the base level.

Table 3: CRPs showing Flagships and approximate W1/W2 weightings (%)

CRP	Flagship	Flagship Title	% of total W1/W2 by CRP
DCLAS	FP1	Priority Setting and Impact Acceleration	15%
	FP2	Pre-breeding and Trait Discovery	25%
	FP3	Variety/Hybrid Development	30%
	FP4	Integrated Land, Water and Crop Management	15%
	FP5	Improved Rural Livelihood Systems	15%
Fish	FP1	Integrated Sustainable Aquaculture	44%
	FP2	Sustaining small-scale fisheries	35%
	FP3	Fish value chains and nutrition	21%
FTA	FP1	Tree Genetic Resources for production and resilience	17%
	FP2	Enhancing trees and forest contribution to smallholder livelihoods	25%
	FP3	Sustainable global value chains and investments	12%
	FP4	Landscape Dynamics, productivity and resilience	20%
	FP5	Climate change mitigation/adaptation opportunities in forests & agroforestry	26%
Live stock	FP1	Animal Genetics	25%
	FP2	Animal Health	25%
	FP3	Feeds and Forages	20%
	FP4	Livelihoods and Agri-food Systems	15%
	FP5	Livestock and the Environment	15%
Maize	FP1	Enhancing Maize's R4D Strategy for impact	9%
	FP2	Novel Diversity and Tools for increasing Genetic Gains	27%
	FP3	Stress Tolerance and Nutritious Maize	45%
	FP4	Sustainable Intensification of Maize- Systems for better livelihoods of SH	14%
	FP5	Adding Value for Maize Producers, processors and consumers	5%
Rice	FP1	Priority setting, upgrading, and impact assessment along the rice value chain	20%
	FP2	Sustainable Farming Systems for improved livelihoods	20%
	FP3	Global Rice Array	20%
	FP4	Climate Smart Rice Varieties	20%
	FP5	Accelerating Impact and Equity	20%

CRP	Flagship	Flagship Title	% of total W1/W2 by CRP
RTB	FP1	Discovery Research for enhanced utilization of RTB Genetic resources	30%
	FP2	Adaptive productive varieties and quality seed of RTB crops	22%
	FP3	Resilient RTB crops	18%
	FP4	Nutritious food and value added through post-harvest innovation	12%
	FP5	Improving livelihoods at scale	18%
Wheat	FP1	Enhancing Wheat's R4D Strategy for Impact	10%
	FP2	Novel diversity and tools	28%
	FP3	Better varieties reach farmers faster	42%
	FP4	Sustainable Intensification of wheat based farming systems	14%
	FP5	Scaling Up and Out	6%
A4NH	FP1	Biofortification	21%
	FP2	Food Safety	21%
	FP3	Food Systems for Healthy Diets	24%
	FP4	Improving Human Health	12%
	FP5	Country Outcomes, Evidence, Enablement	22%
CCAFS	FP1	Climate Smart Practices and Portfolios	38%
	FP2	Climate Info Services and Climate-Informed Safety Nets	22%
	FP3	Low Emissions Development	20%
	FP4	Priorities and policies for CSA	20%
PIM ¹¹	FP1	Technological Innovation and Sustainable Intensification	25%
	FP2	Economy-wide Factors Affecting Agricultural Growth and Rural Transformation	15%
	FP3	Inclusive and Efficient Value Chains	15%
	FP4	Social Protection Strategies and Programs	10%
	FP5	Governance of Natural Resources	15%
WLE	FP1	Regenerating Degraded Landscapes	24%
	FP2	Land and Water Solutions for Sustainable Intensification	23%
	FP3	Sustaining Rural-Urban Linkages	13%
	FP4	Managing Resource Variability, Risks and Competing Uses for Resilience	19%
	FP5	Integrated NRM in Agri-Food Systems	21%

The programs will be designed to provide an integrated set of approaches, coordinated with research and development partners around the globe, to address the higher-level goals of the system and to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs in a way that individual projects rarely can. The new strategic intent to coordinate CGIAR activity in a selected set of countries, leading to nationally aligned site integration plans, will also enhance the efficacy and likely outcomes of place based research and a systems approach to agricultural research for development.

¹¹ The FPs nominal funding does not sum to 100% and FP budgets will be reviewed and to accommodate the gender funding platform, expected to be between USD3-5 million per annum.

2.3 Call for enabling platforms

Accomplishing the goals of the SRF calls for a more effective, integrated approach to research and delivering outcomes. Two of the major inputs into CGIAR research are: (a) the genetic diversity inherent in agricultural crops (plants and animals); and (b) global knowledge and data, that both need to be analyzed and used in an efficient and cost effective manner. There are major opportunities, recognized by CGIAR's Mid Term review, to enhance CGIAR scientific and information capacities, to link to global actors and to enhance the speed and efficiency of research. This Guidance thus also includes a targeted call for three CGIAR service platforms falling into the following two broad categories:

- (i) Establishing CGIAR system genetic resources capability
- (ii) effective management and leveraging of data to enable Big Data capability

Guidance on the elements of the three platforms is set out below, with a summary providing information on budgets and other key aspects.

(i) Establishing CGIAR system genetic resources capability

The genetic diversity present in CGIAR genebanks remains key for delivering system wide goals and outcomes included in the SRF. Identifying and using genetic variation contributes to enhanced productivity, sustainability and resilience of Agri-food-systems. The Agri-food systems CRPs that are being called for rely on the genebanks. The ISPC's report on biotechnology in the CGIAR identified the need to bring together a critical mass of CGIAR and partner science with modern scientific services to provide the analysis of useful diversity and to bring this more rapidly and effectively to the service of the crop and animal breeding programs of CGIAR. It is important therefore to establish a **Genebanks platform** for the maintenance and improved efficiency of CGIAR's genebanks, and the services they provide. **Genetic resources policy** – to be included in the genebanks platform - needs to keep pace with global changes to protect diversity and to keep open the appropriate flow of improved varieties for agriculture. The policy issues cover all the aspects from collection, conservation and use, benefit sharing requirements and the needs of users. It therefore covers all the above themes and policy development in CGIAR needs to be broadly informed and globally appropriate.

It is also important to establish a **platform on genetic gain** to service the research needs of the breeding programs and their partners. A key function of this platform is to ensure rapid flow of genetic diversity information into modern breeding programs, through system wide genotyping, phenotyping and bio-informatics services.

Both these platforms should be outward looking to ensure use of the available global skills and services and to serve the needs of users beyond CGIAR.

A second realization of the biotechnology report, and a key tenet of the SRF and the CGIAR Mid Term Review Report¹², was the need for more comprehensive capacity in the management of Big Data generally, as well as the direct relation to the **data and information management at all levels of the conservation, analysis and use sequence for genetic resources**. CGIAR works in and for developing countries in a rapidly changing global environment.

The nature of the call therefore is to establish:

1. **A Genebanks platform** to cover the continued services of the CGIAR genebanks. Modules¹³ of the proposal should be: (i) a strategy and business plan to continue the collection of genetic resources to fill gaps in collections¹⁴ and with the specific intent of collecting materials with relevance to combatting the stresses associated with a changing climate; (ii) a schedule for the continued upgrading of collections and their maintenance¹⁵; (iii) initiation and implementation of a germplasm health unit that is relevant to the safe transfer of CGIAR crop plant materials and their relatives; and (iv) establish system-level capacity and advice for genetic resources policy. The business plan should set out the continuing activities to secure funding support in the long term future for the genebanks. The first three modules should be developed by the **Crop Trust working with a panel of genebank managers**. Module leadership by additional expert groups should be considered. The fourth module should be developed according to the Biodiversity-led pre-proposal, including experts external to CGIAR, and provide a means and schedule for independently advising genetic resources governance, and CGIAR at large, on high priority matters related to genetic resources policy.
2. **A system-level Genetic gains platform** that will service the research requirements of the programs through three modules: (i) implementing approaches to analyze and exploit diversity in gene bank accessions and help identify traits of importance for the goals of the Agrifood-system programs; (ii) set up and streamline genotyping and phenotyping systems and services to respond the needs of Agrifood system services (working on both crop plants and animals) with an appropriate strategy for the prioritization of effort for the initial period of the platform; and (iii) establish bioinformatics capacity of utility to both genetic resources conservation and research functions in a manner that can interface with other Big Data needs of the CGIAR system. This would include current and enhanced capacity such as the BecA-ILRI Hub and the Integrated Breeding Platform together with a coordinated approach to the emerging role of genome editing. **The proposal should be developed jointly**

¹² <http://library.cgiar.org/handle/10947/3405>. See p33.

¹³ A module is considered as a functional unit of a platform, e.g. GR policy under the Genebanks platform.

¹⁴ Includes collecting, outreach and partnership activities as described in the core activities scenario in *CGIAR Genebank Options Paper for FC13*, Consortium Office/Crop Trust, April 2015.

¹⁵ Includes achieving minimum standards and data management (ibid.)

by the Center proposers of the earlier genetic gain pre-proposal and should include a business plan in which realistic costing of service provision to the agrifood programs and future funding and sustainability of the platform are described.

Further, to establish a single governance mechanism for the two platforms, which is anticipated to include (provisionally) qualified funder representatives, the leaders of the two platforms, a member of the System Office and experts drawn from national programs and/or the private sector. The purpose of having a common governance approach is to ensure that the approach to these platforms is well coordinated and orchestrated across the Centers, also ensuring that it leverages and dovetails with the Open Access/Open Data initiative where relevant. The Genetic Resources Policy group would furnish their advice to this body, *inter alia* and the cost of convening this body twice a year should be included in the policy module. The common governance arrangement should be agreed and appear in both proposals.

(ii) Effective management and leveraging of data to enable Big Data capability

The ability to manage big data sets (such as DNA sequence information at the level of whole genomes or populations) provides the opportunity for **increased impact, by accelerating research and seeking out new traits and associations, to improve understanding of system synergies and complexities, as well as ability to devise appropriate, timely interventions. CGIAR will amplify its effectiveness** when data from different fields can be utilized together and easily visualized and manipulated (such as **genetics and breeding data with biophysical, spatial and household preference data**). This is another field where science and technology outside CGIAR is developing extremely fast and a platform is envisaged as a system-wide effort to ensure such developments are leveraged to support CGIARs research.

A key tenet of the SRF and the CGIAR Mid Term Review Report was the need for more comprehensive capacity in the management of Big Data.

The nature of the call therefore is to establish:

- 3. CGIAR capability in the collection, management and analysis of Data: A platform on Big-Data, Information and Knowledge.** Large amounts of biophysical and socio-economic data about the global food system are stored by different organizations, and our capacity to collect vast quantities of new data is increasing at a nearly exponential rate. The contributions of the CGIAR programs over their lifetimes will be substantial and should align with world standards to maximize their accessibility and reusability. This data will not only be in the fields of genetics and genomics but in all areas of research (spatial, biophysical social and economic), access to and analysis of which will provide opportunities for deeper and faster

insights into food system dynamics. Leveraging existing infrastructure and capability outside the CGIAR is an opportunity that should be explored further.

This call is made jointly to IPFRI and CIAT on the basis of their earlier expression of interests, to collaborate in the formulation of a proposal for a single system platform. This platform will improve CGIAR capacity and data management based on the FAIR principles (above) in close alignment with the genetic gains platform so that a unified approach is proposed, first for genetics/bio-informatics and then for the establishment of capacity in other system activities. Anticipated activities include the development of analytical tools and goes beyond genetics related bio-informatics. Whether funding for a comprehensive platform on Big Data, Information and Knowledge will be awarded in the base budget or in the uplift budget scenario (as suggested below) will be assessed on the basis of the proposal received.

(iii) **In summary:**

- Of the platforms considered at the pre-proposal stage:
 - Genebanks and Genetic Gain are the subjects of this call for full proposals in the base USD900 million budget scenario.
 - Whether the Big Data platform is funded in the base budget, or only as part of the uplift budget scenario will be determined after receipt of the proposal.
 - Genetic Resources Policy is part of the Genebanks platform.
 - Coordination of system-wide Gender and Gender Research is called for as a Flagship within the PIM Full Proposal.
 - Capacity Development is envisaged as part of all CRP Full Proposals, with system wide coordination through an enhanced Community of Practice (with a role, function and budget – estimated at \$1 Million per year for three years - to be finally determined after review of the CRP Full Proposals, at the discretion of the Fund / System Council).
- Of particular importance will be the need to build the connections of the genetic resources policy initiative to independent sources of expertise and to link the genetics and genomics data initiative to the establishment of capacity to manage Big Data, information and knowledge in the system more broadly.
- The form of the Genetic Gains platform and its interaction with the Agri-food systems programs will be the subject of a meeting for CRP leaders, Consortium and Fund Council representatives in mid-January which is expected to feed into proposals.

- A system level platform on Big Data, Information and Knowledge is also called for. A coherent approach to what will be required for the system at large should be proposed. However, installation of capacity for genomics and bio-informatics will be established first under the genetic gains platform, and then the initial expectation is that other fields of data management and the development of analytical tools will be deployed subsequently, possibly at higher levels of funding (under an uplift budget scenario), depending upon the quality of the review and at the discretion of the Fund/System Council.

A simplified proposal template for platforms will be included in the on-line tool in which the emphasis will be on platform organization and operation, strategy, prioritized activities, funding and co-investment, partnerships and outputs in terms of support to discrete program objectives and strict adherence to CGIAR principles for IP, open access and reporting. Budget definition should be at the level of modules (which replace Flagships in these submissions) as well as the overall platform according to the provided standard line items.

2.4 How the new portfolio differs from phase I.

The CGIAR's new research portfolio differs from its predecessors in several key ways:

- **It shifts from separate commodity based programs to an approach that uses eight major Agri-food systems programs as entry points** to integrate the commodity-based research with place-based research to focus on the livelihoods challenges facing farming households.
- It recognizes that **new science**, particularly in genetics and genomics, can be efficiently harnessed for the increased performance of CGIAR breeding and improvement programs through the development of new **coordinated service platforms** linked to global skills and services and linked to Big data and information and knowledge management and analysis.
- **It integrates CGIAR Research Programs on Grand Challenges**, namely: Nutrition and Health; Water Land and Ecosystems (including soils); Policies, Institutions and Markets; and Climate Change will work closely with the eight Agri-food systems CRPs within relevant agro-ecological systems and so channels the broad elements the individual outputs of the CGIAR's portfolio towards the development of integrated human welfare and environmental outcomes working in a systems context. This focusses the work of the CGIAR on high priority global issues such as climate change and the achievement of the SDGs.

- **It represents a major re-emphasis of CGIAR engagement at national level.** CGIAR will use its International Public Goods work across the research portfolio to better inform and better align with regional and country priorities for greater impact through research and development partnerships; Coordinated CGIAR Country frameworks – leading to site integration plans as referred to in the SRF and other documents - aligned to national priorities will be key to integrating the efforts of the CRPs. The country frameworks will serve as a vehicle to engage strategic national and other partners in a focused manner to establish shared goals and responsibilities. Country frameworks will provide an accountability framework for the CRPs to ensure delivery and scale of demand driven innovation to serve the needs of small holder farmers, pastoralists, fisher-folk and forest dwellers, as well as poor consumers more efficiently and more effectively.

It is well recognized that adoption of approved practices at scale will not be achieved without attention to **gender, youth and capacity development**, (and these are specific elements of the call outlined in Chapter 3) and leveraging **Big Data/ICT**, to make sure that agriculture is commercially viable, sustainable and able to support a nutritious and diversified food system. These aspects need to be the major lens for technology design and delivery and so integrated into the value chain programs and the systems flagship delivery. The programmatic structure of the portfolio enhances strong Communities of Practice (CoPs) to enhance critical mass and the ability to spread best practice within and outside CGIAR.

The Consortium will develop a paper presenting a system-level description of the portfolio for the next Fund Council Meeting (FC15) in May 2016.

3. Key elements of the call

This section outlines key elements that must be included in each full proposal (and builds on earlier development of proposed Flagships from the pre-proposal stage).

3.1 Program descriptions, including Flagships, clusters of activities, cross cutting activities.

At the CRP level, proposals should:

- Demonstrate a meaningful contribution to the quantitative CGIAR targets as well as the qualitative CGIAR Results Framework as identified in the SRF;
- Focus on clearly defined research questions;
- Identify and describe the scientific and strategic rationale, gender and partnership strategy for maximizing impact, and overall theory of change and impact pathway for the program as a whole; and
- Provide descriptions for a number of Flagships through which the program aims to contribute to development outcomes in specific geographies or thematic areas.

The full proposal must then set out the research plans in sufficient detail to allow assessment of:

- The overall excellence of the proposed research program, including scientific quality, originality and relevance;
- The track record of the proposed teams, the strength of the partnerships and partner strategy for maximizing impact, and the potential impact and 'reach' of the proposed outcomes; and
- The appropriateness of the proposed detailed budget in relation to the scale of the challenge being addressed and the potential promise of the research.

Flagship projects and clusters of activities

Each proposal will need to specify:

- a. How it is broken down into a small number of structured **Flagships**. Each Flagship will have specific objectives that address sub-IDOs and may produce several outputs and research outcomes to achieve 2 to 3 of the CGIAR targets specified in the SRF; and
- b. For internal CRP management purposes, clearly articulated **Clusters of Activities** (CoA) that are sub-projects of each Flagship (in general 5 to 8). Each CoA should result in products, services or attributes linked to the objectives, or research outputs. A detailed budget will be developed at the level of each Flagship. The W1-W2 funding requested for each CoA plus its overall outcome focus will be required for

each cluster of activities (but not a detailed budget by line item). The contributions expected of CoAs and Flagships to crosscutting themes will need to be specified in the narrative and a specific allocation of funds to gender will need to be identified (as specified in section 3.5).

3.2 Site integration

An important strategic advance sought through CGIAR’s phase II portfolio approach is the adoption of country coordination strategies leading to *site integration plans* for key CGIAR countries¹⁶. The SRF states: “*The CRPs will coordinate with each other to ensure that, in key geographies, their activities are aligned for maximum impact. The CRPs’ collective, coordinated commitments in these geographies will be summarized in site integration plans to enable transparent interaction with local stakeholders. The consultation process will be pursued through the GCARD.*”

The definition of site integration plans is underway for the highest priority countries (table 4) in late 2015 and early 2016. Full proposals will identify countries in which they work and target countries for outcomes. However, in particular, they will be required to show in their submission how they participate or contribute to the future site development in CGIAR target countries and what this means in program terms. A realistic schedule for the organization of these country level collaborations and the development of site integration plans is required. The target countries selected by the CRPs for such coordination efforts are:

Table 4: The CRPs proposed the following list of 6 countries for (more intensive) site integration ++, i.e. the highest priority for site integration:

Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Nicaragua	Nigeria	Tanzania	Vietnam
------------	----------	-----------	---------	----------	---------

Table 5: Additionally, the CRPs proposed list of countries for site integration+:

Bangladesh	Ghana	Mozambique	Rwanda
Burkina Faso	India	Nepal	Tanzania
Cameroon	Kenya	Nicaragua	Uganda
DRC	Malawi	Niger	Vietnam
Ethiopia	Mali	Nigeria	Zambia

¹⁶ During drafting of this document, the term *country coordination strategies* was used, recognizing the need for joint interactions between CRPs and countries on national priorities, identification of the CGIAR plans or “offer” in relation to the national agro-ecologies and aspirations, identification and implementation of aligned activities and leading to the rationalization of the management and communication requirements and costs of the CGIAR in those countries through site integration. Because planning for the initiative has already been pursued under the banner of *site integration*, the use of this latter term is retained here.

This step will provide added impetus to the focus of CGIAR research and provide a more concrete framing for the Results Framework. Thus, full proposals will be expected to provide:

- a. An indication of the site integration (**+ and ++**) **countries** in which the CRP is involved.
- b. **Documentation of the engagement and consultation activities** that this CRP has been involved in towards achieving country plans and site integration planning, both internally and externally e.g. documents shared through the GCARD3 website (www.gcard3.cgiar.org).
- c. **With reference to the site integration plans developed** or to be developed for each of the countries applicable to this CRP, show how these have led or will be developed in into identifiable research activities and associated funding detailed in the Full Proposal.
- d. **How Centers and CRPs will collaborate** will increase efficiency and effectiveness in each country, through shared research sites, infrastructure, facilities and offices, and speaking with one CGIAR voice with the national government, coordinated by the Lead Center for each country as selected by the centers.

The Consortium will request the Lead Centers in each of the 20 site integration countries to review whether and how the CRP Full proposals align with the country coordination and site integration plans.

3.3 Partnership strategy

A wide range of successful partnerships is essential for CGIAR to achieve its goals. CRP full proposals will therefore need to include a **detailed partnership strategy** that outlines:

(i) Who and what type of partners

The partnership strategy will identify the strategic partners of the CRP. It is recognized that CRPs will likely engage with hundreds of partners, and the partnership strategy will define their engagement broadly, including how the partnerships themselves will evolve, change and/or mature over time. The partnership strategy should nevertheless aim to focus on the small number of strategic partners that are critical to achieving the CRP's outcomes, and describe their role¹⁷, responsibilities and budgets explicitly.

The strategy should indicate the full range of partners that will be involved in the CRP, with important considerations of:

¹⁷ A table for the standardized reporting of key partnerships in relationship to partnership modalities, will be provided as part of the submission template.

- a. Relevant research partners – including changes in these
- b. Government, policy and public sector partners
- c. Development partners
- d. Private sector actors- CRP theories of change should explicitly acknowledge the role of the private sector in CGIAR’s mission

(ii) Roles of partners

The strategy should highlight the role that partners will play and the avenues for their involvement, e.g. at the discovery, proof of concept, and pilot level (if relevant) and scaling-up phases along the impact pathways.

Also, CRPs are specifically expected to identify and demonstrate the role of partners in research and management/ governance. A typology of partners should be developed, indicating how partners provide leadership on components, and specifying partner membership of steering or management committees.

(iii) Partnership Modalities

The strategy should explain the various ways in which partnerships may be engaged in, for example, joint calls for proposals with national research organizations and funding agencies, or research programs with researchers from national research agencies and universities, to joint research with NARS, Advanced Research Institutes, private sector and other appropriate research entities.

(iv) Strategic Partnership Activities

The strategy should document additional strategic partnership activities such as:

- a. **Ongoing engagement and dialogue** with stakeholders and partners starting with how the CRP has interacted with the GCARD3 process, including any other consultations that have taken place in support of the proposal and how the CRP intends to continue ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners and stakeholders; and
- b. Existing efforts and plans for future **alignment with and support of regional initiatives** [such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP)]. Note: for example, evidence should be provided at full proposal stage that CRP activities: (i) enhance the capacity of mandated African institutions in articulating and advancing an Africa Science and Technology agenda for agriculture; and (ii) strengthen synergies between CGIAR planning processes for its Africa-oriented initiatives and CAADP-based priorities in research, policy analysis, training and effective knowledge management and sharing existing efforts and plans for **involvement with key global processes**.

(v) Sustaining partnerships

The partnership strategy should highlight how key factors that can contribute to the success of partnerships will be integrated, including: a common agenda, shared measurement (e.g. data collection and analysis), activities coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action, consistent and open communication lines, and backbone and coordination support.

(vi) Partnering capacity

The strategy should demonstrate the capacity of the CRP to successfully partner and carry out its partnership strategy, including specialized and experienced staff, existing mechanisms, tools and technologies, capacity enhancement methods, amongst others.

(vii) Appropriate resourcing of partnerships

CRP full proposals should indicate how partners and partnerships will be resourced and indicate transparently the share of the CRP budget allocated to strategic partners. This may be through the allocation of a credible percentage (e.g. 20-30%) of total project funding to the different partnerships (to be identified in the sub-award budget category¹⁸ of the budget tables and in the narrative), identifying (i) those that are self-funded, (ii) those co-funded between the CRP and the partners, and (iii) those entirely funded by the CRP.

3.4 Capacity development strategy

To properly translate research into development outcomes, additional investments to cutting edge research are necessary in a number of cross-cutting areas. Capacity development has been identified in the SRF as a strategic enabler of impact for both CGIAR and its partners. It goes far beyond the transfer of knowledge and skills through training, and cuts across multiple levels – individual, organizational and institutional.

CRPs are referred to the existing Capacity Development Framework developed by the Community of Practice (CapDev) to provide a framework across CRPs and help prioritize and seek synergistic approaches to system-level capacity development¹⁹. **Therefore, it is expected that individual CRP full proposals should take advantage of this CapDev Framework thinking to frame their descriptions of their capacity development plan that addresses the four major areas outlined below.**

¹⁸ All budget line items will be defined in the on-line tool. Additionally, two table templates, listing CGIAR partners and then other strategic partnerships listing the “intensity” of collaboration will be part of the on-line tool.

¹⁹ Framework:

<https://library.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10947/3414/CGIAR%20Capacity%20Development%20Framework%20Working%20Draft.pdf?sequence=4>

(i) CapDev role in impact pathway

Expectation: CRPs are expected to outline the role that CapDev will play in the expected research for development activities, and its expected outputs and outcomes along the impact pathway.

Explanation: As CapDev is a strategic enabler of innovation along the impact pathway, it is important to consider how the CRP plan can link to the system initiative in each of stages/activities along the impact pathway and contribute to the achievement of intended impact.

(ii) Strategic CapDev actions

Expectation: CRPs should demonstrate which of the elements of the CapDev Framework it will implement and how.

Explanation: CRPs should use the CGIAR CapDev for outlining and planning the capacity development activities that best suit the particular program and can be implemented along its impact pathway. CRPs should identify which of the elements of the CapDev Framework are for them the most appropriate to implement, especially at Flagship level, while making sure there is aggregation and cohesion across the whole CRP for the CapDev elements and activities chosen.

(iii) Indicators that track progress and contribution to CapDev Sub-IDOs

Expectation: CRPs are expected to map their CapDev activities into one of the composite indicators (and can consult the CapDev Indicators²⁰ framework as a guide).

Explanation: As the CGIAR SRF includes a capacity development Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO) and four sub-IDOs, a set of robust indicators have been developed to help CRPs in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of CapDev interventions, and linking the sub-IDOs and the CapDev Framework, so as to provide CRPs with additional ways of mapping their planned CapDev activities, to track progress, assess efficiency and effectiveness of CapDev actions, and capture lessons learned for continuous improvement.

(iv) Budget and resource allocation

Expectation: CRPs are expected to budget for CapDev at both CRP and Flagship levels in the narrative and identify budgetary contributions to the Capacity Development IDO in the Performance Indicator Matrix.

Explanation: The CRP should demonstrate that budgets allocated for CapDev have a credible share of the total CRP budget (e.g. totaling around 10% although amounts may vary in individual Flagship budgets).

²⁰ https://library.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10947/4080/CapDevIndicators_18%20Nov2015.pdf?sequence=1

3.5 Gender strategy

CGIAR is committed to inclusive impact, creating opportunities for women, and marginalized groups generally, through equitable access to resources, information and power in agriculture. Proposals should demonstrate that ensuring gender-responsive outcomes is an integral component of a CRP's strategy for maximizing impact.

Full Proposals must include a fully elaborated **gender research strategy**. The proposal's gender strategy should refer to an existing CRP's approved Gender Strategy. The proposal should explain the significance of the proposed research to the SRF's gender IDOs and sub-IDOs and address gender issues in its theory of change, impact pathways, work plans, monitoring and evaluation approach, and reporting, at CRP and Flagship level.

Proposals are required to include a **Gender Summary as an annex** of, respectively, up to two pages each, that provide:

- **Synthesis** of the gender analysis (with major papers or reports referenced) that was done before the proposal's research priorities and questions were set, and how that informed the priority setting;
- **Overview** of how gender will be operationalized in the research agenda, and how progress towards gender-responsive outcomes will be monitored and ultimately evaluated; and
- **Target beneficiary population** numbers should be sex-disaggregated.

Where feasible, it is more accurate to express target beneficiaries as male and female individuals rather than as households, for the purpose of gender equity.

Budget - budgeted costs must show the special designation of funds needed to accomplish the expected gender-responsive outcomes, as specified in the flagship budget narrative. The narrative must provide and explain the total budget allocation. Coordination of effort with the PIM platform and the locus of budgets between programs should be described, where this is applicable. Additionally, budget allocated to the specific achievement of the sub-IDO on gender and youth must be identified. However, the amounts for gender-related research activities /outcomes must be clearly distinguished from youth-related activities/outcomes and not subsumed (see following section), even though the sub-IDO treats both. An annex of terms and examples relating to the description of gender and for the gender budget submission will be part of the on-line submission tool.

3.6 Youth

The age of populations involved in agriculture in its widest sense is altering according to the extent of different overlapping trends in different regions. In South and South East Asia agriculture suffers from an ageing rural population simultaneously with growing youth unemployment as populations grow. In Africa, the bulk of the population will remain rural-based in the next decades, but rural to urban migration is taking place in all regions.

There is an opportunity in CGIAR's phase II portfolio to include (amongst others) analyses of these trends, to test models for engagement and entrepreneurship and to include successful pilots in wider scaling strategies. Whilst successful outcomes will contribute to the achievement of the joint gender and youth sub-IDO, full proposals are required to describe proposed activities on youth separately from gender work *per se*, and to identify the budget that will be attributed to these youth-related activities.

3.7 Results Based Management and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Strategy

The SRF is both a guide and goal for each CRP, setting out high-level collective aspirational performance targets for the CGIAR SLOs. The SRF describes the CGIAR approach to Results-Based Management (RBM) that is to be fully implemented in the CRP2 Portfolio starting from 2017. CRPs are expected to propose a RBM framework which is described as a management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impact. This framework should describe how CGIAR's approach to RBM is conceptualized and will be operationalized²¹ for the CRPs to demonstrate commitment to accountability and adaptive management.

The core of the RBM framework will be the CRPs Performance Indicator Matrix that summarizes and budgets the outcomes the CRP proposes to deliver (both quantitative and qualitative). The Performance Indicator Matrix and associated budget will be part of each CRP's contract and provide the basis for assessing a CRPs value for money, monitoring progress during implementation (percentage completion, comparing expenditures with results), evaluation, as well as impact assessment.

²¹ Guidance on operationalization of the RBM framework by the CRPs and Platforms is being developed by the Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Community of Practice (MELCoP) of the CGIAR and, once finalized, will be available through the on-line tool.

Results-Based Management

Each CRP must have in place a Results Framework that describes a CRP's overall **theory of change** with its **impact pathway** for the program as a whole (annex 2 outline template section 1.3²²) and more detailed **ToCs at the flagship level** (template section 2.3). Delivery of research outputs must be linked clearly with, and show how they contribute to, anticipated results (max. 1 page graphic illustration per each ToC complemented with a max. 2 pages narrative description per ToC). Where there is a direct relationship, the ToCs may be similar to the ones from the pre-proposal with improvements addressing reviewers' suggestions. For new programs or new FPs, new ToCs should be described. Key assumptions and a rapid risk mitigation plan are to be included (template section 2.3). Results- and outcome-related risks are inherently part of the ToC assumptions and are expected to be addressed in that context (template sections 1.3, 2.3). Other program risks should be dealt with in the respective section (template section 1.15 and see below). It is recommended to keep the ToC text and figures together to facilitate the understanding of text and figure in parallel. In addition, nested ToCs could be proposed for specific actions (e.g. gender, capacity development) in a targeted country.

CRP Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Impact Assessment

In the Phase II CRPs, CGIAR is moving beyond an M&E that focuses accountability at the level of inputs to *outcomes, and associated budgets (expenditures)*. As better theories-of-change are articulated, there is more scope and need for monitoring at the outcome level and for information to inform learning and adaptive management. **In managing for outcome-focused results**, there is a need to improve the way we monitor, evaluate, learn and adapt during the project cycle. It implies a design that relates annual reporting or program progress with financial reporting, and performance assessment. These need to be linked to ensure consistency, one-time data entry and utilization of collected data. Standardization of minimum requirements, consistency and alignment of reporting are key to this and demand interoperability of platforms.

As a principle of the 2nd call, all CRPs and their Lead Centers must follow a harmonized and homogeneous monitoring and reporting framework.

²² All references to template sections in this part of the document are to Annex 2, and then the relevant section of that Annex and the underlying item.

Making space for learning

Under this accountability regime, some of the 'results' being monitored may not be associated with numerical targets per se. Rather, a significant part of the accountability reporting will be describing pathways and results against expected changes, and what has been learned and what adjusted or refocused as a result. MEL needs to provide the evidence of what is working and how it is working. CRPs need to describe their concept of a robust monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy to drive an outcome-focused culture.

Presenting the MEL strategy in proposals

The basic elements that a CRP MEL Strategy under a 'results-based management' approach needs to cover the following. Each should be described in a manner specific to the CRP:

- Present a theory of change and impact pathway. Have means to monitor and adjust the **theories of change** to ensure their robustness and relevance to the emerging context, ensuring that any such adjustments are transparently justified and documented; improve CRP programs and Flagships based on that evidence-based information; and describe how CRPs will use TOC as a dynamic tool in support of RBM and its adaptive management.
- **Evaluate CRP performance** where possible by harmonizing indicator selection and use for similar research and target outcomes with other CRPs - both for monitoring and evaluation to ensure that quality of science and research, as well as quality of research towards development. This will also assist continuity and consistency across relevant CGIAR units (e.g. IEA, ISPC/SPIA and IAU).
- Guide and make strategic use of the **internal and external evaluation, ex-ante and ex-post impact assessment** work carried out by CRPs, IEA, ISPC/SPIA and IAU to provide credible and useful information for accountability and learning purposes. This includes the following:
 - a. **A rolling evaluation plan** would include a cycle of CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs), as a systematic and objective assessment of the program and as building blocks to the external evaluations conducted by the IEA. A budget of up to USD 300,000 per year will be identified in the narrative of the CRP against the consultant line item for the conduct of these CCEEs. Joint CCEEs will be sought to leverage the resources of multiple CRPs and to assess performance within a geographic focus (likely in line with the site integration plans) or thematic area (e.g., seed systems, nutrition, and gender). A list of key sector x country combinations could be defined and presented in this plan in order to clearly help CRPs to develop synergies.
 - b. Plans for other **research reviews or evaluative studies** necessary to monitor and evaluate progress (e.g. the effects constituent element of its ToC, is having or has had on specific development outcomes or as identified in the Performance and Risk Monitoring Plan).

- Means to **foster learning** and the proper **documentation of practices and results**.
- Means to monitor **key risks** on the CRP level to the realization of the assumptions underlying the various FP TOCs that have potential to undermine the CRP's success (template section 1.15)
- Approaches and means to monitor the relevant **standardized indicators towards key indicative targets** (defined in the SRF, SLO targets for 2022 and relevant to the CRPs own declared contributions) complemented with evidence-based case studies of progress towards outcomes.

CRP Impact Assessment Strategy

A CRP also needs to describe an *Impact Assessment Strategy*, outlining how the program will assess impacts (adoption, influence, outcomes at sub-IDO level, and longer-term impacts), and scale of impacts, arising from the work that the CRP conducts individually or jointly with others, including from antecedent research directly or indirectly related to the CRP.

In particular, the means by which appropriate baselines for measurement have been established (or will be re-constructed) should be described and how relevant data will be stored should also be cross-referenced to the monitoring section and Open Access report. For 2017 – 2022 this will include assessing the impacts of legacy work and delivery of outputs from a previous pipeline of research, or should assess the impacts arising from the work of others to refine claims for impact in the CRP's own results framework. In both cases, sufficient budget should be identified in the CRP narrative to fulfil the impact strategy. Without a system in place, it is not possible to provide useful information on the continuing contributions of the CGIAR to the SLOs or to SDG targets and this capacity will affect the scoring of the proposal.

Finally, the MEL strategy in the full proposal must also include:

- A brief description of how the CRP will meet the requirements for an **Information Communication Technology (ICT) online platform**. The platform²³ should support the program's planning, reporting, adaptive management and learning as part of the operationalization of the CRP's MEL strategy (max. 1 page); and
- A brief narrative to explain **budget allocation** towards RBM and MEL work (staffing, activities, platform). To ensure internal coherence in the MEL strategy, the suggested balance of the budget between the monitoring, evaluation and learning elements of the strategy should be briefly explained. Generally, between 2% -5% of CRP budget should be allocated. Resources that go towards MEL need to be made explicit, keeping in mind that most of the work required to strengthen and validate the ToC during early stages of research is done by researchers themselves. Generating

²³ Further detail on the dimensions of the platform will be provided through the on-line tool.

evidence to support key assumptions supporting a ToC should be seen as part of the core research agenda. Additionally, a budget of up to USD 300,000 per year needs to be identified in the narrative of the CRP against the consultant line item for the conduct of CRP Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEEs). Joint CCEEs will be sought to leverage the resources of multiple CRPs and to assess performance within a geographic focus (likely in line with the site integration plans) or thematic area (e.g., seed systems, nutrition, and gender). A list of key [sector x country] combinations could be defined and presented in this plan in order to clearly help CRPs to develop synergies.

Portfolio Analysis: Performance Indicator Matrix: budget and uplift budget scenario

Each CRP is required to submit as part of the full proposal a **Performance Indicator Matrix** (that may build, when relevant, on the pre-proposal version taking reviewers' recommendations and updated details into account) and identifying annual indicators of performance towards targets (annex section 3).

It will capture the CRPs and individual flagships' proposed contributions to the qualitative and quantitative 2022 CGIAR targets from the SRF, and the allocated budget amounts by outcome (see annex 3 and PIM table outlines for more details).

Each CRP is requested to prepare its proposal on the basis of an indicative average annual core budget (totaled over all funding sources, that is, W1, W2, W3 and Bilateral) for the Full Proposal, adding up to the low or conservative resource mobilization (RM) scenario that the CGIAR FC/ System Council is confident will be available. To the extent possible, the goal is to ensure that the W1 and W2 portions are stable and predictable over the life of the CRPs. In addition, each CRP will also be awarded an uplift budget, corresponding to the additional resources that may become available in the medium and high RM scenarios.

It is important that we can distinguish the outcomes and results associated with the CRP core and uplift budgets: clearly a CRP will prioritize its activities differently in the face of the different levels of certainty of the funding. The budget of the base scenario is USD 0.9 billion for one year across 12 CRPs and two platforms. The scenario for an uplift budget would be USD 1.35 billion.

We therefore expect CRP full proposals to submit two sets of performance indicator matrices: **one** adding up to the core budget, and **a second**, less detailed, on increased levels of outcomes to be expected under the uplift budget.

The Performance Matrix will require three types of result:

- a. Qualitative outcomes directed at the Results Framework's sub-IDs in 2022
- b. Quantitative outcomes against the CGIAR targets in 2022²⁴
- c. Description of measures of progress towards outcomes for the intermediate years²⁵

After submission of the full proposals, the analysis of the performance indicator matrix will seek to answer six key questions:

1. What share of the 2022 interim CGIAR targets is a proposal aiming for?
2. Are the outcome targets consistent across the summary narrative and the Performance Indicator Matrix? Are they reasonable and credible?
3. Are outcomes budgets by Flagship and Outcome reasonable and credible?
4. Is the portfolio positioned to deliver on the CGIAR Targets?
5. How W1/W2 money is being prioritized?
6. Are there investment gaps in the portfolio?

The (revised, as necessary) Performance Indicator Matrix accepted by the System Council at the time of CRP Full Proposal approval will be part of the CRPs contract and a key element for monitoring progress and assessing a CRP's performance.

3.8 Intellectual asset management

An important criterion for the assessment of CRP Full Proposals is the effective and efficient management of intellectual assets within the CRP at every stage of the life cycle, to effectively disseminate CRP research outputs and maximize impact.

CRP participants are expected to manage intellectual assets in line with the [CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets](#) (CGIAR IA Principles)²⁶ and their [Implementation Guidelines](#)²⁷. The text narrative should link to a more elaborated annex. The notions of "intellectual assets" and IP rights will be covered by additional explanatory information in the submission tool.

Full proposals are required to describe the CRP strategy for intellectual asset management having regard to the following issues as relevant to the CRP:

²⁴ The Consortium encourages a meeting or exchange by CRP proponents (preferably in January of 2016) to derive common understanding of the scientific underpinnings, data and assumptions, that CRPs will employ to provide these target estimates (and improve submissions over the pre-proposal stage).

²⁵ E.g. an updated version of the PIM narrative table from pre-proposals.

²⁶ The CGIAR IA Principles were approved by the Consortium Board and the Fund Council and became effective on 7 March 2012. As they are part of the Common Operational Framework, they apply to all funding and implementation aspects of the Strategy and Results Framework, including CRPs, regardless of funding source or implementing entity.

²⁷ The Implementation Guidelines for the CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets were approved by the Consortium Board and became effective on 14 June 2013.

- Relevance of IA management to the CRP, critical issues to address in CRP implementation and anticipated challenges from an IA management perspective
- Project planning and implementation
- Key dissemination pathways for maximizing global impact
- Operations (e.g. technical infrastructure, planned activities)
- Coordination and decision making (e.g. policies, procedures, committee, task force)
- Indicative resources (e.g. human and financial - including a budget statement)

The full proposal should involve critical evaluation of the following and should be drafted in consultation with IP Focal Points as relevant:

- (i) Current CRP capacity (whether within the lead Center or within the network of strategic partners) versus needs required to achieve the stated outcomes of the CRP proposal; and
- (ii) Current budget versus budget needs required to achieve the stated outcomes of the CRP proposal.

When full proposals are updated and re-submitted on 31 July 2016, CRP's may be asked to elaborate on the above strategies/plans, if necessary, following Consortium Office feedback concerning adequacy of planning and resourcing for effective IA management in the CRP.

3.9 Open Access and Open Data

The overall objective of CGIAR policy is to open CGIAR's trove of research data and associated information for indexing and interlinking by a robust, demand-driven cyberinfrastructure for agriculture, ensuring that research outputs are open via FAIR principles – that is, they are **Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Re-usable** to enhance innovation, impact, and uptake.

CRPs are expected to implement OA/OD strategies in line with the [CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy](#) (OADM Policy) which became effective in 2013 across all Centers, and its [Implementation Guidelines](#) which became effective in 2014. Several key donors also have OA/OD policies (e.g., the [Bill and Melinda Gates Open Access Policy](#); [USAID's policy on Development Data](#)); they are currently working towards a common requirement (which is likely to be adherence to the CGIAR OADM Policy).

The *CGIAR Open Access and Data Management Policy* complements the [CGIAR Principles on the Management of Intellectual Assets](#) which became effective in 2012 and deals more generally with the dissemination of intellectual assets for maximizing global accessibility and impact. CRP level strategy related more broadly to intellectual asset management is dealt with separately in section 3.8 of this Guidance.

Full proposals are required to describe the CRP strategy/plan for open access and open data to final research outputs (publications and associated data sets, and software at minimum) having regard to the following issues, and referencing the goals of CGIAR's Open Access and Data Management Policy:

- Planning for and implementing Open Access and Open Data: critical issues and anticipated challenges
- Project planning and implementation
- Operations (e.g. technical infrastructure and interoperability considerations, data quality assurance, training activities)
- Coordination and decision making (e.g. workflows/procedures, governance)
- Budget and brief narrative for required resources (e.g. human and financial)

The text narrative should link to a more elaborated annex.

The proposal should involve critical evaluation of the following and should be drafted in consultation with Open access/open data managers or focal Points as relevant:

- (i) Current CRP capacity (whether within the lead Center or within the network of strategic partners) versus needs required to achieve the stated outcomes of the CRP proposal;
- (ii) Current CRP infrastructure for open access and open data and dissemination/scale-up pathways versus needs required to achieve the stated outcomes of the CRP proposal; and
- (iii) Current budget versus budget needs required to achieve the stated outcomes of the CRP proposal.

When full proposals are updated and re-submitted on 31 July 2016, CRP's may be asked to elaborate on the above strategies/plans, if necessary, following Consortium Office feedback concerning adequacy of planning and resourcing for effective open access/open data management in the CRP.

3.10 Communication

Communication is a critical success factor for the CRPs to deliver their development impact and for CGIAR to achieve the outcomes articulated in the SRF. Communication contributes in two ways. First, by contributing to the achievement of CRP outcomes at different scales. Second, by sharing program results to enhance visibility and demonstrate accountability.

CRPs should include a combination of the following six elements as a communications strategy:

1. Engaging in policy dialogue to scale up results
2. Engaging with actors on the ground to scale out technologies and practices
3. Communicating about the program, the science, results and progress towards achievement of the SRF 2022 targets throughout the CRP lifecycle
4. Communicating and engaging with partners for effective development impact
5. Promoting learning and sharing of information to improve communications and collaboration within and across CRPs
6. Making CRP information and resources open and accessible

Communication activities also help enable and enhance, gender, capacity development, and monitoring and evaluation activities, at all stages of the CRP impact pathway.

(i) Dimensions of communication

Full proposals should outline two dimensions of communications. First, at the flagship level, the proposal should include an **overview of the communications tools and approaches to effectively engage with stakeholders** to achieve development outcomes. Second, for the CRP as a whole, a **plan should be developed to raise visibility and demonstrate accountability**. The CRP should also clearly indicate how communications will be delivered between the CRP, lead Center and partners.

CRPs must allocate sufficient resources (identified in the narrative) to deliver the communications activities listed in the proposal, with appropriate budgeting at the CRP, Flagship and project levels. The key budget considerations are dedicated staff, product development (publications, websites, etc.), events, engagement activities and information management.

(ii) Criteria and Template

Criterion for Communications at the CRP level

Evidence that communications are integrated to ensure the delivery of research and development impact of the program, with a clear link to the program's theory of change.

Criterion for communications at the Flagship level

Evidence that an appropriate mix of tools and approaches drawn from the 6 suggested key areas of intervention will be put in place to ensure continuous communications and knowledge sharing amongst all flagship partners and stakeholders.

CRP proposal Template

CRP narrative - Detail the approach to communications and knowledge sharing amongst partners and stakeholders.

Flagship level narrative - Outline a plan for how an appropriate mix of communications and knowledge-sharing tools and approaches drawn from the six suggested key areas of intervention will be put in place.

3.11 Governance and Management

A critical learning opportunity from the first round of CRPs is to ensure that all strategic partners have access to an equitable share of the budget based on their agreed contribution and ability to deliver outcomes cost-effectively. Selection of a Lead Center (to be agreed by the CGIAR Centers) should be based on science leadership, expertise and managerial capacity.

Lead Centers should be members of the CGIAR Consortium in order to continue to draw on and build the strengths of the system, in line with the original design of the reforms: to make sure the 'whole efforts of the Centers are greater than the sum of their parts'. In addition to the science leadership and expertise of the Lead Center, science and development partnerships and networks will also play an important role in the success of the CRPs.

Proposals are required to outline the proposed CRP governance and management arrangements in a manner consistent with Fund Council endorsed IEA Review of CRP Governance and management²⁸. Additionally, CRP proposals will need to identify an Independent Steering Committee, a CRP Leader and a CRP Management Committee.

Figure 2, below, illustrates the overall reporting structure that each CRP should implement.

²⁸ <http://iea.cgiar.org/evaluation/review-crp-governance-and-management>

Figure 2. CRP governance and reporting structure



While CRPs should be led by CGIAR Centers, non-CGIAR institutions may lead Flagships within CRPs, depending on their comparative advantages and track record. A Lead Center should not lead most of the Flagships within a given CRP.

Flagship leading partners, whether CGIAR or non-CGIAR, should appoint a senior researcher as Flagship Leader (and Principal Investigator) and have dedicated senior research staff with strong publications and/or development impact track record; ability to deliver against relevant development outcomes; a commitment to raise bilateral or W3 funds to complement W1 and W2 funds; and ability to lead complex multi-partner projects including ability to attract strong partners.

All Lead Centers and Flagship leaders should comply with the Consortium's reporting, financial and legal guidelines, including information systems for open data and information exchange; and mechanism for evaluating research quality and ethical reviews. An important role for Lead Centers is the role of a convener with an open and horizontal culture, which readily enables partnerships to flourish. Ensuring even-handedness, transparency and accountability should be of top consideration. It will be important that CRP leaders can demonstrate ability to provide management (including adequate and near real time budget management) of the CRP which is likely to be an on-site assessment criterion.

Participating Centers should have:

- Dedicated senior research staff charged with leading the Center's activities with the CRP.
- Critical mass of senior research staff with strong track record.
- Proven leadership of multi-partner projects and ability to attract strong partners.
- Proven ability to deliver high-quality reports – linked to CRP outcomes.

- Information systems for open data and information exchange.
- Mechanism for research quality, gender mainstreaming and ethical reviews, particularly with respect to personal data, animal research and genetic and biological risks.

Lead Centers and their strategic partners in a CRP should agree on a joint resource mobilization strategy, with practical guidelines for CRP- and Center-led fundraising, for the CRP prior to submitting the full proposal.

Proposals are expected to indicate which CGIAR Center and other partners are strategic partners (tier 1 partners). Not all CGIAR Centers participating in a CRP need to be strategic partners; particularly for those CRPs in which many or most centers participate. Selectively identifying Centers as strategic partners will reduce transaction costs. Strategic partners should include at least the Lead Center and all partners who lead a Flagship. Strategic partners should have institutional representation in the CRP's governance (either a seat on the Independent Steering Committee, or representation through another partner if a CRP has too many strategic partners). Strategic partners will also be represented on the CRP management team through their CRP director, a Flagship leader, or a Principal Investigator (for strategic partners that do not lead a Flagship). Each CRP is likely to have a very large number of other partners (tier 2 partners) that need not be involved in governance and management as are the strategic partners. Tier 2 partners may also have a much more simplified contracting and reporting requirements.

3.12 Budget, Financial management and reporting

The assessment appraisal of CRP full proposals will include a review of the financial resources requested by each flagship in conjunction with the results they plan to achieve.

The proposal documents – including budget template, budget narrative, and budgets linked to the performance indicator matrix - have been developed to provide consistent information that will support the value for money analysis across the portfolio.

The budget review will typically seek to answer the following key questions:

1. Is the proposed mix, level, and timing of spend appropriate for the proposed activities and outcomes? Are the assumptions behind major cost drivers reasonable? (e.g. personnel cost, time allocated, input quantities, input unit costs, inflation, etc.)
2. How much are the target outcomes reliant on different sources of funding (W1, W2, W3 and/or bilateral) and, if so how much by each funding source. How much is already available in Bilateral?
3. What are the requirements for fundraising to assure full target achievement of the proposed work plan?
4. What is the appropriate investment schedule to assure achievement of the proposed outcomes?

5. At what stage of the development timeline is the work of the proposed flagship?
6. What are the three (3) major risks to the CRP executing against the budget as planned apart from lack of funding?

As described in the results based management section of this guidance (section 3.7), the reporting framework will focus not only on financial aspects, but also on the progress against the outcome targets for each flagship so that CRPs can actively manage their flagships, and implement adjustments to the initial plan and budget as needed. Ideally, the CRP payment schedule would be tied to intermediate results and demonstrated action on progress monitoring, to be reported periodically, in order to manage the financial exposure of the portfolio based on the level of uncertainty to achieve the outcomes. The financial reporting framework will be developed in details later on, but not in this guidance document.

The approach for budgeting is designed to ensure that the proposal reviewers can receive adequate financial information from the CRPs as they submit their final proposal.

The key design principle of the budgeting framework and tool is “right-size rigor”: that is, striking the right balance between the level of detail, and the information needed for decision-making.

Another key principle is “flexibility”: while we need some standards on how the financial information is delivered to us, we also acknowledge that CRPs need some flexibility in how they structure their budgets given the different context in which they operate. The current plan is to design a budget tool to capture only information relevant to the reviewers regarding how financial resources are used. In other words, the tool will be designed to capture details as needed and appropriate. This means that we expect Lead Centers to ask much more detailed planning information from Participating Partner Centers.

What budgets and how many per CRP will need to be submitted?

Each CRP will be requested to prepare its full budget at the flagship level on the basis of an annual base budget (totaled over all funding sources, that is, W1, W2, W3 and Bilateral) for the 6 years, adding up to the base scenario of approx. USD 900 million of which we expect W1-2 to comprise approx. 30%. It is assumed that the mechanism how W1 and W2 funds are allocated will not change from the current process. If significantly more W3 and bilateral funds are obtained it would be expected that a clear indication is given of additional results at the outcome level.

In addition, each CRP will prepare at the flagship level an *uplift indicative budget*²⁹, clearly linking what additional outcomes will be obtained with such additional resources. It was agreed that the uplift or high funding scenario is based on overall resource availability of approx. USD1.350 billion.

One budget submission is required broken down by year of the proposal period (2017-2022). Only if significant changes to the original budget happen, will a revision be required after the first three years of the programs.

Each flagship will need to submit the following documents:

1. A budget template (excel) with each Participating Partner's³⁰ detailed budget information approved by the CRP Director.
2. One flagship budget narrative that will provide rollup summary financial tables of the Participating Partners budgets, as well as additional context and explanation regarding the figures and the connection between the budget and the scope of the activities funded under that budget.
3. One CRP budget narrative that will provide rollup summary financial tables of all flagships, plus the CRP Management and Support Costs, plus a CRP Strategic Competitive Research grant as separate line items as a separate line items. It is expected that the CRP Management and Support Cost will be around 3-5%(as was the case in the pre-proposals)

CRP Management and Support Cost

The CRP Management and Support Cost can either be a fixed amount agreed between the CRP Director and the Lead Center or can be expressed in form of an indirect (CRP overhead) cost.

In either case, the following represented the cost elements of the Management and Support Cost:

- Management fee charged by the Lead Center to handle CRP Finance and Administrative matters (Finance, accounting, reporting, contracts management, legal, HR, IT, communication-if handled by Lead Center)
- CRP director including related cost – benefits and on-cost if customary (computer, vehicle lease and office space) based on percentage time allocation
- Infrastructure and general and administrative charges if CRP leader is not located at the Lead Center

²⁹ Total amount by flagship without detail i.e. natural classification

³⁰ Defined as the Lead Center, and Program Partners or Participating Centers which sign a PPA with the Lead Center

- Flagship leader and regional coordinators only if a significant percentage time (>50%) is dedicated to managerial activities.
- Financial and administrative support based on time allocation
- CRP Management Committee and related costs
- Independent Steering Committee (or Science Committee) and related costs
- Communication activity related specifically to CRP communication and webpage (not if handled by Lead Center)
- CRP internal audit by the CGIAR Internal Audit Unit, or its future equivalent in the new System governance structure
- CRP internal and external reviews (e.g. CCEEs and other evaluations and reviews), as well as impact assessments (if not explicitly budgeted as part of FPs)

Every effort should be made to find cost-efficiencies within CRP management and support costs through better use of existing systems and increased coordination, whilst nevertheless recognizing the importance of ensuring that the CRP has sufficient support to deliver on its goals.

Information and level of budget detail for the participating partner's budgets

Each Participating Partner's budget will provide budget information at the natural classification level, irrespective of the sources of funding:

- Personnel and benefits: a detailed list of the principal investigators assigned to the flagship project. For the other personnel categories, they can be grouped together as one line item. Cost information will include annual salary per FTE (or an average if multiple positions are grouped together), time allocation, and a percentage benefits or on-cost. Computer, vehicle lease as well as occupancy cost can be included but the budget will need to specify in the notes column whether or not these additional on-costs are included in personnel or in Supplies and Services.
- Travel: annual travel cost per category of personnel (for e.g. Principal Investigators). To refine these cost estimates, we recommend that the budget itemize these costs for different regions of the world.
- Capital equipment: a list of items with a value of at least USD 3,000 and a useful life of more than one year. Goods that do not fit this definition should be included under Supplies and Services. Items assigned to a specific position (e.g. vehicles, office computers, space etc.) cannot be budgeted as capital equipment but rather be charged based on usage to Personnel or Supplies and Services.
- Supplies and Services: a list of items including supplies, services including consultants, or others that do not fit in any of the categories above.
- Non CGIAR Collaboration: contracts to third-party organizations who directly contribute to the scope of the project (please note that subcontracting amongst Participating Partners is not supported).

- Indirect cost: the rate of indirect cost that the participating partner's organization typically charges. This is not to be confused with the CRP Management and Support Cost that the lead center can claim for the overall management of the CRP.

The budget tool will allow the Participating Partners to provide a breakdown of the project's total costs by four types of sources of funds: W1+W2; W3, Bilateral; Other.

While the Lead Center or the CRP Director might ask for a budget at the level of the activities and /or cluster of activities, we will not require that the budget information be submitted at that level, for either Natural Classification nor for Source of Funding.

CRPs will be asked to provide high level breakdown (not line item details) of their total 2017-2022 budget for:

- outcomes by flagships (in the performance indicator matrix)
- gender-responsive outcomes (in the performance indicator matrix)
- capacity development (in the performance indicator matrix)
- impact assessment (in the budget narrative)
- intellectual asset management (in the budget narrative)
- open access and data management (in the budget narrative)
- communication (in the budget narrative)

Financial reporting for the participating partners

The financial reporting tool is included in the budgeting tool and if used as reporting tool it can be updated during each (likely annual) review cycle. At the end of a cycle, the Participating Partner will report actual expenditures by Natural Classification and report these numbers in the budget tool. This will allow the reviewers to conduct variance analysis. The Participating Partner will also provide a reforecast of expenditures for future years to reflect in the financial numbers any changes to the project plan going forward. Variances across Natural Classification categories greater than 10% or greater than USD 500,000 (W1+2) over the lifetime of the project will require the approval of the System Office.

4. Proposal review and Approval Process

In accordance with the process and timetable set out in table 1 (Chapter 1), table 5 below sets out the key actors in the proposal review and approval process.

Table 5: Key actors in the pre-proposal review and approval process

Actor	Role
Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of CRP proposals, and system-level Platforms (invited Centers or groups). Deadline of 31 March 2016.
ISPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External independent technical review of the proposals and platforms against the criteria set out in section 4.1 to 4.4 Will rate the proposals as worthy or not of funding and provide review comments. Rating and review comments provided to the Fund Council/System Council for decisions on selection and funding for 2017
Consortium Office in consultation with the Fund Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concurrent with the ISPC independent peer review, analysis of management/operational aspects of the proposals and the system-level platforms (e.g. including governance and management, IP and open access, budget, and value for money) as a contribution to decision making at the Fund Council/System Council level. Preparation of deliberative papers for the Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee (SPPC) of the Consortium Board in preparation for Fund Council 15.
SPPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of collated data from the ISPC review and Consortium Office/Fund Office analysis of management/ operational aspects, to inform preparation of the Consortium prepared portfolio/system-level document that will accompany the submission of the set of full proposals for discussion and review by the Fund Council (as requested by the Fund Council in December 2015).
Consortium Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review SPPC recommendations on the package of proposals and recommended actions (as relevant) for both CRP fundable and other elements together with the recommended financial allocation for supported CRPs (as an indicative budget envelope but not the final approved budget allocation).
Fund Council/ System Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial discussion on full proposals as submitted at 31 March 2016 at FC15. Approval of the full proposals after re-submission to take into account inputs received during the review processes for the full proposals. Approves the budget for approved proposals

ISPC categorization of proposals

ISPC has been requested by the Fund Council to assess research priorities and the Consortium Office will analyze value for money of the proposals submitted to implement the SRF generally and reach the CGIAR targets specifically.

Both will be based on the submitted proposals, plus all additional material available such as CRP annual reports, evaluations and audits.

Proposals for CRPs and platforms submitted for ISPC external independent peer review may be rated for inclusion or exclusion by the ISPC with an explanatory commentary.

Priority Setting, Value for Money and Budget Allocation

The Consortium/System Office will comment on value for money or implementation issues (such as Intellectual assets and Open access etc.) and will recommend what they consider the best option for advancing the proposal or platform and make recommendations accordingly to the Fund Council for decision at FC15.

The ISPC review and recommendations, together with the Consortium Office/System Office's analysis, will inform recommendations for financial allocations to each approved CRP as indicative budgets. The Fund Council will set the overall budget envelope and W1/W2 ceiling (see Chapter 6).

All CRP full proposals are required to make the case for their contribution to implementation of the SRF in terms of the results they propose to deliver and the budgeted costs of each of those results at Flagship level for all CGIAR Fund windows and bilateral sources combined. Budgeted costs must be total costs, inclusive of overheads, management costs, partnership costs and all costs with a special designation such as for gender research, capacity development or co-investment.

4.1 Criteria for Assessing Full Proposals

The following criteria have been developed in consultation with the ISPC and will be used to review proposals. There is no formal weighting applicable to the criteria, and each criterion must be adequately addressed.

4.2 Criteria at CRP level

Overall analysis as an integral part of the CRP portfolio

- Strategic relevance
- Consideration of 'grand challenges'
- Inter-CRP synergies

- Comparative advantage of the CGIAR /CRP versus other suppliers or avenues of research
- Rigor and credibility of the scientific arguments underpinning the rationale for the pre-proposal.
- The formulation of the CRP provides added value over conducting individual FPs activities separately
- Lessons learned from previous research and earlier external reviews and evidence that recommendations have been adequately considered and factored into the proposal³¹
- Site integration: the CRP demonstrates how it intends to work on key site integration plans i.e. the steps taken and will be taken.

Theory of change and impact pathways

- The plausibility of the **Theory of Change** and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDOs and IDOs and the feasibility of the **Impact Pathways**.
- Application of a convincing strategy to select **partners** (e.g. through GCARD3 and other mechanisms). What is the CRP strategy for selecting partners and for interacting with other CRPs?

Cross-cutting themes (also to be applied to each Flagship)

- Have the 'grand challenges', in particular **climate change**, been recognized in planning the research?
- Evidence that **gender** issues have been considered within the proposed research framework, an indication that this has actually been used in shaping research priorities and that appropriate questions/hypotheses are being posed.
- Evidence that **youth** issues have been considered within the proposed research framework, have been used in shaping research and that appropriate questions/hypotheses are being posed.
- Recognition of the importance of the enabling environment.
- Commitment to capacity development through adoption of some of the nine elements of the CapDev Framework, and how the activities adopted contribute to the outputs/outcomes of the CRP.

³¹ Generally, proposals should hyperlink relevant scientific references, annual reports, evaluation reports, responses to previous ISPC commentaries, impact evidence, etc. to support the arguments made. Specifically, the ISPC views the full proposal review as part of the second call process (as per Chapter 1). Where programs are a continuation of work conducted under phase I or detailed in pre-proposals, the ISPC requires proposals to include an attached document in which, i) the key issues raised by the ISPC at the pre-proposal stage are listed, ii) the actions taken to address them are presented, iii) any other significant changes since the pre-proposal stage are also listed (incorporations or exclusions). Space will be provided in the submission template for this attachment.

Budget

- The extent to which the **resources requested**, relative to the expected outcomes, represent an attractive and appropriate investment for donors, that is, is the proposal **good value for money**³²?

Cohesion

- Is there a convincing **integration of activities** between relevant Agri-Food programs with Global Integrating programs to address CGIAR goals in a value added manner?
- Is there evidence that the CRP as a whole will make a **significant contribution to delivery** at the CGIAR system level (e.g. are there strategies and mechanisms that the CRP will deliver more than a series of country program results?)
- Has the CRP indicated **focus countries** for which the CRP intends to work together with other CRPs on the preparation of **site integration plans**, including carrying out necessary consultations with national partners and stakeholders to align with national priorities and activities?

Governance and management

- Evidence of **leadership and management** commitment with an appropriate governance structure that is assessed as having the potential to successfully implement the proposed program.
- Are the **governance arrangements** proposed in line with the CRP Governance and Management responsibilities³³?
- The **track record** of the Leadership Team (recruitment criteria if leaders not in place), that is, the leaders of the Flagships plus the CRP leader.

4.3 Criteria at Flagship level

- **Strategic relevance**, assessed via degree of alignment of question or problem to be addressed and expected outputs with sub-IDOs in the SRF and with national and regional priorities and initiatives (e.g. identified through GCARD3 or others)
- Recognition of the need for the research to account for **potential unintended consequences** on SLOS that are not the primary focus of the research. For instance, a particular concern is attention to **food loss and post-harvest waste**.
- Assessment of **scientific quality**, the novelty of what is being proposed (new science, new methodologies, science partners), the track record of the proposal leadership team on the basis of delivery in current CRP³⁴ (with respect to

³² The dimensions of this assessment are provided in section...

³³ e.g. in line with the IEA CRP governance and management review.

³⁴ This case applies to proposals stemming from phase I work. When new programs, FPs or platforms or leadership for these elements are considered, the criterion would be "track record of the proposed

publications and demonstration of commitment to quality within the CRP) and through use of peer review mechanisms at the project proposal level.

- **Comparative advantage** of the CGIAR and Lead Centre, together with proposed partners in the specified research area: to be assessed based on whether alternative suppliers have been considered, collaborative advantage, or whether the research being proposed is particularly appropriate at this time, the topics to be covered offer long term benefit over and above what others are doing and if appropriate resources are being requested.
- The plausibility of the **Theory of Change** and its alignment with the SRF sub-IDs and IDs and the feasibility of the **Impact Pathways**. At the flagship level this includes the way CoAs are aligned and/or fit together and partnerships (see following).
- Strategic fit and relevance of **named partners**: Do the partners included add value in terms of scientific contribution? Do they contribute to achieving systematic change and impact at scale?
- Significance of expected contribution to SRF **gender IDs**
- **Budget** – appropriate to the scale of the flagship activities and the outcomes claimed.

4.4 Criteria for Platforms

The platforms are envisaged as CGIAR system-level service platforms and will therefore be judged (and ultimately monitored) on the appropriateness and efficiency of their services and outputs to users, rather than the outcome focus of the programs – nevertheless a clear relationship should be established in terms of platform goals and illustrated demand from programs. Criteria for assessment of Platforms will therefore include:

- The extent to which the platform will **contribute to key strategic needs of CGIAR** (i.e. alignment with SRF and feasible contribution to targets described in the Results Framework)
- **Comparative and competitive advantage of CGIAR and ability to deliver** (Evidence - e.g. summary of the state of the art in the area and any lessons learned from previous or related efforts - to explain why CGIAR should lead the proposed platform).
- **Partnerships** (including such elements as the underlying strategy and advantages of partner choices, recognition of particular strengths and weaknesses—and how these will be addressed.)
- **Coherence and added value of the platform to the CRP portfolio and external users** (The extent to which the organization of the platform can add value to CGIAR programs and the cross-cutting interactions between other platforms and programs).
- **Track record and credibility of the team** (e.g. skills, experience, and capacity of the proposed lead as well as partners and collaborators to deliver fully and in a timely manner on the proposed activities).

leadership team on the basis of prior delivery of quality publications, scientific innovations and development outcomes”.

- **Mechanisms for assuring the quality of data and of science.** (e. g. demonstration that effective means for data collection, and for ensuring data curation and its utility for sharing are in place; the adequacy of the plans for engagement with the research community; the adequacy of linkages to other institutes and providers; the quality and efficiency of platform arrangements, outputs and services).
- **Governance and management** (are the leadership, management and governance arrangements appropriate to CGIAR responsibilities for stewardship and IPG use, including for partnership management).
- The **business case** (whether the proposed business case will ensure sustainability of the CGIAR capability).
- **Appropriateness of budget in relation to the activities proposed**

5. Proposal template

A proposal template for on-line submissions is being prepared and will follow the headline components of the outline and page length estimates are provided as Annex 2. The template will be available by the end of February, in advance of the time of the proposal submission. Additional templates for the Value for Money estimation are provided in Annex 3.

6. Allocation of budgets to CRPs in phase II

The following principles will guide allocation of budgets for the CRP2 period (2017-2022):

1. **Window 1:** Portfolio-wide W1 funds will be allocated by the System Council to CRPs annually according to the approved Finance Plan, based on priorities determined by the System Council, performance metrics, and the allocation of CRP-wide W2 funding by donors, to fund the approved W1-2 CRP budgets and associated outcomes.
2. **Window 2:** In addition to W1 funding, CRP-wide W2 funding is allocated by individual donors to approved CRPs to fund the approved W1-2 CRP budgets and associated outcomes. While Lead Centers are allocated W1 and W2 funds separately, CRPs receive, use and report on W1 and W2 funds expenditure jointly and do not keep track of W1 and W2 separately.
3. **Strategic use of W1-2.** CRP proposals will prepare Flagship budgets, and indicate the share of W1-2 funding of each Flagship budget (as a percentage) and are expected to allocate W1-2 funding strategically³⁵ to research that builds the basis for outcomes and impact on the ground (with W3/Bilateral funding primarily supporting the scaling up and out).

³⁵ The Fund Council has scheduled a discussion on the strategic uses of W1-2 funding at FC15 in May 2015, with preparatory actions required of Fund Council members in advance.

In a recent document titled *'Memorandum for Fund Council discussions on December 11, 2015, High Level Summary of strategic uses of W1-2 Funding'* the current CRPs have identified the range of constructive uses to which W1-2 funding has been put in phase I. These include maintenance and innovation in gene banks; strategic long term investments - e.g. in seed investments and to ensure rapid response to diseases; gene discovery, phenotyping and processing initiatives; translating nutritional and gender-relevant knowledge for use in rural contexts; working with partners and extending learning; cross CRP learning and foresight modelling.

4. **Mapping W3/Bilateral projects.** Each W3/Bilateral project will either be mapped to a CRP, or designated as a Center Bilateral project, during the proposal stage. Mapping a W3/Bilateral project to a CRP requires ex-ante approval of the CRP director. Co-funding a Bilateral project with W1-2 funding is allowed for CRP Bilateral projects, not for Center bilateral projects. CRP bilateral projects are considered an integral part of the CRP and managed and reported as part of the CRP reporting.
5. **Outcomes associated with W1-2 funding:** CRP full proposals will identify outcomes of CRPs for each Flagship project, and indicate the percentage share W1-2 funding of each Flagship, and thereby associate outcomes with W1-2 funding.

Base and aspirational uplift budgets. CRP proposals will specify base budgets and associated outcomes at Flagship level, corresponding with a conservative or low resource mobilization scenario (constant USD900 million total for the portfolio, with maximum 30% W1-2), as well as aspirational or uplift budgets and associated outcomes (growing budgets, at USD1.35 billion average, with maximum 40% W1-2). Detailed budgets are only required for the base budget; for the uplift amount clearly indicated additional outcomes and associated budgets will need to be specified through a second (costed) Performance Indicator Matrix only.

Annex 1 Caveats to preparation of full proposals

The Fund Council's decision³⁶ to give the 'green light' for pre-proposals to proceed to full proposals was made subject to the caveats raised by the following three groups:

- 1.1 Written comments from the Joint Consortium Board/Centers/Fund Council Working Group, dated 30 November 2015
- 1.2 Written comments from CGIAR's Independent Science and Partnerships Council, dated 9 December 2015
- 1.3 Discussions of the Fund Council on 11 December 2015.

As set out in the Preface of this Guidance, these caveats form a critical additional element for consideration during the development of full proposals.

The collective portfolio submitted by the Centers/partners in response to this call for full proposals must be accompanied by a summary of how each of the respective caveats have been addressed.

1.1 Caveats expressed by the Joint Consortium Board/Centers/Fund Council Working Group, in its Memorandum to the Fund Council to express support for a 'green light' to move to full proposal development, dated 30 November 2015

Recognizing the advances already made in the re-submitted portfolio in the highly constrained time available, **the full proposals submitted by 31 March 2016 for ISPC review must address to the satisfaction of the ISPC, and contributors, the points set out below, to strengthen further the rationale and coherence of the planned research agenda.** Thereby delivering increased confidence that with funding from 2017 onwards, it has the capacity to deliver on SDGs in general and the Results Framework and CGIAR targets as set out in the SRF:

1. Greater attention to discerning the role of regionally focused yield-gap closing/sustainable intensification research in the system, as distinct from and a complement to global public goods research in areas such as crop breeding, livestock health, food policy, and others.

³⁶ Taken on 11 December 2015 and communicated to stakeholders by the Acting Fund Council Chair on the same date by email.

2. More clearly articulating the strength of the arguments for maintaining genebanks and genetic gain as two separate platforms rather than an integrated effort³⁷.
3. Crosschecking that consolidation at the cluster of activities or flagship level has not delivered unintended adverse consequences such as removing clarity for key research priorities and/or increasing transaction costs.
4. Providing a clearer understanding of National Partners' requirements, and how the scientific and financial program elements support them.
5. Setting out more clearly the interconnection and resources available for the proposed Communities of Practice in gender/youth and capacity development, with particular attention to ensuring engagement of partners in the respective Communities of Practice. Specifically, ensuring that the proposed communities of practice operate in a way that will result in meaningful progress towards sustainable engagement and impact.
6. Reducing as many transaction costs as possible, particularly regarding management burden.
7. Providing greater emphasis on soils, animal genetic conservation and the potential impact of big data across the portfolio, not limited to genetic gain.

1.2 Caveats expressed by the ISPC, dated 9 December 2015

ISPC comments on the portfolio (a paraphrase of a longer document submitted to the Fund Council) are as below:

Portfolio level

- Seek explicit prioritization within CRPs (and also between CRPs); balancing research on 'upstream' science with research on how to scale out and up relevant new knowledge and technologies (while leaving the delivery of impact at scale to organizations with that remit).
- Important to capture synergies between CRPs so that the System delivers more than the sum of the CRPs (the One System One Portfolio mantra).
- Clearer explanations of what W1&2 funding will be used for.

³⁷ There were a number of different views expressed during working group deliberations on this topic. Whilst there was no fundamental opposition to separate platforms, there was a call for making a much stronger case as to why they should be separate.

- CRPs should not be expected to adhere to the ‘prioritization’ undertaken in a very short time-frame to produce the ‘Refreshed’ submission, but should hold serious discussion with their partners on which activities to prioritize according to the principles that were agreed at FC14.

Platforms

- 2 new platforms are proposed: Genebanks and Genetic gains. The ISPC is comfortable with the platform on Genebanks.
- Have concerns about the focus of the proposed Genetic Gains and what the creation of such a platform will mean for the AFS CRPs (and theories of change). The ISPC also found the title of ‘Genetic gains’ to be inappropriate as what is proposed is only part of the research required to deliver ‘genetic gains’. The budget needs to be reviewed.
- Supports the concept of an initiative in Big Data and does not want to see this de-emphasized.
- Identify where budget is placed for other arrangements to meet cross cutting system work originally considered through Expressions of Interest at the pre-proposal stage.

Agrifood systems CRPs

- DCLAS: The rationale for DCLAS receiving a ‘C’ rating overall (from the ISPC) related to the breadth of species being considered; the funders are requested to indicate their priorities for this CRP.
- FTA has moved tenure and rights to PIM – although PIM don’t mention that. FTA also wants to move the restoration work to WLE. Given the decreased budgets overall, these 2 CRPs may not accept these moves and the topics may hence disappear. Clarity on the potential loss of these areas is required.
- Livestock and FISH both wish to move some genetics research across to the new platform as may other CRPs, yet the budget sources for those moves are not clear.
- Maize propose to move some bilateral projects out of the CRP due to budget cuts. What is an appropriate balance of W1/2 bilateral at the base funding scenario?
- RAFS (and presumably other CRPs) proposes to reduce the number of targeted IDOs and sub-IDOs – and both RAFS and Wheat make reference to cutting back on capacity development due to budget cuts. Realistic adjustments to current funding and base scenario funding will need to be considered by CRPs and funders.

Global Integrating Programs

- The ISPC is glad that PIM has agreed to take on the role of co-ordination of a System-wide platform or Community of Practice for gender work, although we hope that it will be possible to reinstate the original budget. It is hoped that down-rating gender

from a Flagship to 'Cross-cutting work' does not reflect diminishing importance of gender.

- A4NH and WLE seem to be following the ISPC recommendations (through additional steps for integration with CRPs through defined flagships, while the CCAFS Summary in Annex 2 suggests the budget cuts: 'need a totally new business model', the ISPC understands that only minor changes are now being proposed.

1.3 Additional caveats expressed by the Fund Council during its adhoc meeting on 11 December 2015.

The Fund Council noted that its granting of a 'green light' to move to full proposal development was subject to the caveats noted by the Working Group and ISPC (in their written submission) and the Fund Council's request for enhanced focus on gender and capacity building.

The Fund Council also specifically acknowledged that CGIAR is engaged in an incremental process and some concerns raised by Fund Council members will require additional time and attention before the new portfolio of CRPs is approved.

Annex 2 Outline template of the CRP proposal format for phase II.

Note: The on-line submission tool will call for the materials in this outline and will provide additional instructions, templates or examples for proposal and platform completion. In general, there will be a balance between narrative text and additional information provided as annexes and tables. Reference to additional materials e.g. lead Center/CRPs policies or their updates, impact assessments or evaluations, should be hyper-linked, where appropriate. The Performance Indicator Matrix (PIM) and the budget tables and narrative for *base* and *uplift* scenarios are key components of the submission and examples are provided in the accompanying attachment.

Section 1: The CRP

Total pages: 26 [Proposed page limits for text only (Calibri, font size 11); excluding tables and figures].

Title of CRP

- 1.1 **Rationale and scope.** State the overarching case for the CRP; background analysis (of the targeted agri-food system or global integrative topic); problem statements; strategic and scientific rationale; scope and concepts. Max 4 pages text.
- 1.2 **Goals, objectives, targets.** List the overarching goals and objectives of the CRP, provide a table of the SRF SLOs and crosscutting IDOs being addressed, provide a table with (quantified) targets for each of the 3 SLOs matching the ones in the SRF, broken out by countries where meaningful and with relative distribution of the financial resources needed (see mock up Table 1 in the PIM document); provide link with SDGs and their targets;. Refer to the flagship outcomes. Max 2 pages text.
- 1.3 **Impact pathway and theory of change.** Provide an overall theory of change for the CRP in relation to the major targets set. Ensure that gender, youth, nutrition, capacity development, and climate change are addressed, as appropriate. Max 3 pages text.
- 1.4 **Gender.** Explain how gender issues are being handled by the CRP through its gender strategy, how they have informed the CRP agenda and will be addressed through the research. Max 4 pages.
- 1.5 **Youth.** Explain the extent to which youth are targeted by the CRP *separate from gender-related activities* with reference to specific activities where appropriate. Suggested 0.5 page narrative or linked to a youth strategy (annex) as appropriate.
- 1.6 **Program structure and flagship projects.** Provide brief overview and show how the collective of FPs makes a coherent CRP. Max 2 pages text.
- 1.7 **Cross CRP collaboration and site integration.** Provide brief overview of strategy and implementation of cross-CRP collaboration, including site integration. Summarize partnership and country engagements and consultations that have taken place (planned). One text page is mainly meant to introduce the annex with two tables on cross CRP relationships and other actions towards site integration and there should be coherence between these elements.

- 1.8 **Partnerships and comparative advantage.** List lead partners (CGIAR and non-CGIAR); explain comparative advantage of this CRP partnership, compare with other R&D providers; International Public Goods nature of the CRP. This one page of text should link and refer to a more detailed annex on partnerships and a table of partnership modalities.
- 1.9 **Evidence of demand and stakeholder commitment.** As in the pre-proposal. Max 1 page text.
- 1.10 **Capacity development.** Provide overview of CapDev strategy as it applies to the CRP with planned CapDev activities for the CRP. Max of one page text to provide link to more detailed 4-page annex.
- 1.11 **Program management and governance.** As in the pre-proposal. Max 2 pages text and linked to senior staff cvs as an annex).
- 1.12 **Intellectual asset management.** Explain adherence to CGIAR principles, guidelines. Max half page text linked to an annex with more specific objectives for the CRP in IP management.
- 1.13 **Open access management.** Explain adherence to CGIAR principles, guidelines. Max half page text linked to an annex with more specific objectives for the CRP in data management.
- 1.14 **Communication strategy.** Explain communication strategy for the CRP. Max half page.
- 1.15 **Risk management.** As in the pre-proposal. Max 1 page text
- 1.16 **Budget narrative summary.** Fill out the CRP budget narrative template. Max 1 page text.

Section 2: Flagship Programs

Total pages per FP: 16 [Proposed page limits for text only (font Calibri, size 11); excluding tables and figures].

Title of FP

- 2.1 **Rationale, scope.** State the overarching case for the FP, e.g.: background analysis, problem statements, strategic and scientific rational, scope and concepts; list the grand challenges that are addressed. Max 1.5 pages text.
- 2.2 **Objectives and targets.** Strategic relevance; Table with the SRF sub-IDs (both SLO-level and crosscutting) being addressed and relative distribution of the financial resources needed (see mockup table 3 in the PIM document); List the outcomes and relative distribution of the financial resources needed (see table 3 in the PIM document). Max 1.5 pages text
- 2.3 **Impact pathway and theory of change (for each individual FP).** Ensure that gender, youth, climate change are included. Max 1.5 pages text.
- 2.4 **Science quality.** As in pre-proposal. Max 2 page text.
- 2.5 **Lessons learnt and unintended consequences.** As in the pre-proposal. Max 1 page text.

- 2.6 **Clusters of activity (CoA).** Provide brief overview and show how the collective of CoAs makes a coherent CRP. Max 4 pages text.
- 2.7 **Partnerships.** As in the pre-proposal, by partners at discovery or upstream level, proof-of-concept level, and scaling out (downstream) level; refer to a more detailed annex for overall strategy. Explain CGIAR competitive advantage, compare with other R&D providers; International Public Goods nature of the FP. Max 1 page text.
- 2.8 **Climate change.** Specific detail in relation to the FP. Max 0.5 page text.
- 2.9 **Gender.** Specific detail in relation to the FP linking to overall CRP gender strategy as above. Max 0.5 page text.
- 2.10 **Capacity development.** Specific detail for the FP, in relation to the CRP overall CapDev plan in annex. Max 0.5 page text.
- 2.11 **Intellectual asset and open access management.** Any specific arrangements for within-FP management (refer back to overall CRP description on these topics and link to their annexes), e.g. list open access data bases that will be produced, others. Max 0.5 pages text.
- 2.12 **FP management.** Any specific arrangements for within-FP management, e.g. leadership of FPs or CoAs. Max 0.5 pages text.
- 2.13 **Budget summary.** Fill out the Flagship budget narrative form. Max 2 pages text.

Section 3: Annexes

Total pages: [28, plus excel Performance matrix, plus budget sheets, plus CVs of management staff (text in font Calibri, size 11)].

- 3.1 **Participating Partners Budgets,** provided in template format. Key items to extract from the overall budget will be amounts committed to program management, gender, capacity development and partners.
- 3.2 **Partnership strategy.** Explain strategy for selecting partners. As in the pre-proposal, overview of main partners at discovery or upstream level, proof-of-concept level, and scaling out (downstream) level. List main partners and their roles. Max 4 pages text with one table.
- 3.3 **Capacity development strategy.** Max 4 pages text.
- 3.4 **Gender strategy.** Max 4 pages text.
- 3.5 **Youth strategy.** Max 4 pages text.
- 3.6 **Results based management.** Describe the strategy for monitoring, evaluation, learning (including feedback loops), and impact assessment; table of IDO indicators to be used, and explanation how they are going to be collected. Explain how results-based management is incorporated into CRP management structures. Max 6 pages text.
- 3.7 **Linkages with other CRPs and site integration.** Max 6 pages text and coherent with two template tables.
- 3.8 **Staffing of management team and flagship projects.** Senior staff (CRP leadership/management, FP leaders, CoA leaders or PIs and advisors should be listed).

See Annex 3 for the proposed templates and explanation of the value for money and Performance Indicator Matrix (PIM). The PIM narrative describing major intermediate annual outputs towards the 6-year target outcomes will resemble the Excel reporting table of the pre-proposal. These items will be part of the On-line tool template for the final submission.

Section 4: Platforms

Total pages: 18 [Proposed page limits for text only (Calibri, font size 11); excluding tables and figures].

Title of Platform

- 4.1 **Rationale and scope.** A strategic case should develop the relevance of the proposal to meet CGIAR science priorities and to contribute service functions useful for the improvement of agriculture internationally. State the overarching case for the Platform for adding value in line with the international public goods nature of CGIAR; include problem statements; as part of the background analysis identify competitive/comparative advantage i.e. why the proposing institute(s) should provide the requested capability (skills and resources required); provide scientific rationale; scope and concepts. Max 4 pages text.
- 4.2 **Platform structure and modules.** Provide brief overview and show how the collective of modules will contribute to a coherent, outward-facing capability for CGIAR. In addition, describe the interface of this platform with other CGIAR platforms and programs. Max 2 pages text.
- 4.3 **Impact pathway and contribution to theory of change of the CGIAR and its programs.** Describe how the Platform outputs will be provided to CGIAR and other users to contribute to overall CGIAR outcomes, and how those impacts will result. Max 1 page text.
- 4.4 **Capacity development.** Provide a CapDev strategy as it applies to the Platform with proposed activities Max of one page text to provide link to more detailed annex.
- 4.5 **Platform leadership, management and governance.** Describe the scientific leadership, how the Platform will be managed and how it will be effectively linked to the overall arrangement for genetic resources platforms governance in the CGIAR (where this applies). Max 2 pages text.
- 4.6 **Business case.** The business case should describe the capabilities of the Platform proposed, identifying a number of clear, measurable, high-level objectives which justify its establishment. This will be of 6-7 pages in length and should include:
 - A statement of the relevant **expertise and track record** of institutes and key personnel who will be involved (linked to an Annex with cvs), and how this expertise will be maintained. Max 1 page text.
 - A statement of how **access** to materials, sites, services and networks will be carried out, **supported and maintained.** Max 1 page text.

- A description of the **interactions between the Platform with users**, beneficiaries and other key institutions and how these will be maintained (Max one page including cross CRP collaborations listed in an Annex).
 - **Intellectual asset management.** Explain adherence to CGIAR principles, guidelines. Max half page text linked to an Annex with more specific objectives for the Platform in IP management.
 - **Open access management.** Explain adherence to CGIAR principles, guidelines. Max half page text linked to an Annex with more specific objectives for the Platform in data management.
 - **Communication strategy.** Explain communication strategy for the Platform. Max half page.
 - **Risk management.** Describe risks to platform function and sustainability. Max 1 page text.
 - A more detailed breakdown of the costs specified in the Budget summary. Max half page.
- 4.7 **Budget narrative summary.** Provide the cost structure, expected sources of budgetary support for the Platform and necessary planning for its sustainability. Fill out the Platform budget narrative template. Max 1 page text.

Section 5: Modules

Total pages per module 9 [Proposed page limits for text only (font Calibri, size 11); excluding tables and figures].

Title of Modules

- 5.1 **Rationale, scope.** State the overarching case for the module, e.g.: background analysis, problem statements, strategic and scientific rationale, scope and concepts; list the grand challenges that are addressed. Max 1.5 pages text.
- 5.2 **Objectives and targets.** Strategic relevance; Table with the intended outputs (and the program outcomes that are being addressed through others, including assumptions related to outputs and outcome claims); and relative distribution of the financial resources needed. Max 1.5 pages text
- 5.3 **Science quality.** Identify how scientific quality will be provided and ensured. Max 1 page text.
- 5.4 **System linkages.** Describe mechanisms to be put in place for coordination with AFS and GIP CRPs, site integration activities, partnership strategy and data handling. Max 1 page.
- 5.5 **Climate change.** Are there specific linkages to climate change for the module. Max 0.5 page text.
- 5.6 **Capacity development.** Specific for the module, referring to overall Platform strategy in annex. Max 0.5 page text.
- 5.7 **Intellectual asset and open access management.** Describe any specific arrangements for within-module management (refer back to overall Platform

description on these topics and link to their annexes), e.g. list open access data bases that will be produced, others. Max 0.5 pages text.

- 5.8 **Module management.** Any specific arrangements for within-module management, e.g. leadership of science and policy initiatives and plans for M&E. Max 0.5 pages text.
- 5.9 **Budget summary.** Fill out the Module budget narrative form. Max 2 pages text.

Annex 3 Outline templates for Budgets and Value for Money analysis

This Annex 3 sets out three templates to support preparation of full proposals:

- 3.1 CRP budget narrative;
- 3.2 Flagship budget narrative; and
- 3.3 Performance indicator matrix (including value for money and contribution to the 2022 SRF targets).

Note: These items will form part of the on-line submission tool. Recognizing that a value for money analysis is a new concept for the CRP II phase, there is the potential for a discussion with the relevant stakeholders early in 2016, perhaps in line with the testing of the on-line tool, to clarify use of the templates.

Annex 3.1 - CRP Proposal Budget Narrative

The purpose of the CRP budget narrative is to summarize the information provided in the Flagship budget narratives and participating partners' excel-based budget templates by justifying how the budget cost elements are necessary to implement the CRP overall and accomplish 2022 target outcomes. It should also provide the CRP Management and Support costs, with a detailed description of what is included and how the costs are calculated.

General Information

CRP Name: GRISP
 CRP Lead Center: IRRI

1. Summary

Please fill out the summary table and explain the major cost drivers and how costs relate to planned activities and CRP targets. Explain the rationale behind the level of funding of each flagship and any potential risks in spending as planned and any plans to mitigate those risks (other than funding risks). Also explain how the budget supports country level activities.

Total CRP budget by flagship (USD)

Flagship name	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6
FS1	30,000,000					
FS2						
FS3						
FS4						
FS5						
FS6						
CRP Management & Support Cost						
Total						

Narrative:

2. CRP Funding Plan

Please provide insight into the CRP funding plan: how much bilateral funding is already secured? What are the requirements for fundraising to assure achievement of the proposed 2022 targets?

Total CRP budget by sources of funding (USD)

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6
W1+W2						
W3						
Bilateral						
Other						
Total						

Narrative:

3. CRP Management and Support Cost

Please provide a detailed description of what is included in Management and Support Cost and how the individual cost line items were calculated.

4. CRP Financial management principles

Please describe

- 1) the allocation process of the CRP 2017-2022 budget to the flagships for W1+2
- 2) the level of budget ownership of the flagship leaders (tracking, reporting, revising, etc.)
- 3) Rules and expectations around annual variances for flagship and participating partners budgets
- 4) Expected major capital investments (>\$25,000)

5. Other

Please feel free to use this section to provide any other commentary or information that helps to describe and justify the budget request presented.

Annex 3.2 - Flagship Proposal Budget Narrative

The purpose of the flagship budget narrative is to supplement the information provided in the excel-based budget template by justifying how the flagship budget cost elements are necessary to implement project activities and accomplish 2022 target outcomes. The flagship budget narrative is a tool to help Reviewers fully understand the budgetary needs of the project and is an opportunity to provide descriptive information about the costs, drivers, and risks that can't be easily communicated in the flagship participating partners budget templates. Together, the flagship budget narrative and participating partners budget templates should provide a complete quantitative and qualitative description that supports the proposed flagship budget. Please use this flagship budget narrative to provide a thorough description of your flagship budget and only complete questions that are relevant to your proposal.

This flagship budget narrative will also serve as the basis for the CRP budget narrative which is composed of the flagship budgets plus the CRP Management and Support Cost.

General Information	
CRP Name	GRiSP
CRP Lead Center	IRRI
Flagship Name	Climate Smart Rice Varieties
Center location of Flagship Leader	Africa Rice

1. Summary

Please fill out the summary table and explain the major cost drivers and how costs relate to planned activities and target outcomes. Also explain any potential risks in spending as planned and any plans to mitigate those risks.

Total Flagship budget summary by sources of funding (USD)

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6
W1+W2	10,000,000					
W3	3,000,000					
Bilateral	16,000,000					
Other	1,000,000					
Total	30,000,000					

Total Flagship budget by Natural Classifications (USD)

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6
Personnel	15,000,000					
Travel	2,000,000					
Other Supplies and Services	4,000,000					
Capital Equipment	1,000,000					
Non CGIAR collaboration	2,600,000					
Indirect Cost	3,500,000					
Total	30,000,000					

Total Flagship budget by participating partners (PPAs) (USD)

	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6
IRRI	15,000,000					
CIAT	10,000,000					
AfricaRice	5,000,000					
Total	30,000,000					

Explanations of these costs in relation to the planned 2022 outcomes:

2. Additional explanations for certain accounting categories

Benefits: Describe the components of the benefits (column R of the “Budget Details” sheet) included with the salary costs. For example: pension, health insurance, expatriate costs, Housing/education/vehicle allowances etc.

Expatriate Staff – expressed as a multiplier or percentage over the base salary

National Staff – expressed as a multiplier or percentage over the base salary

Other Supplies and Services: Provide a brief description and rationale for other Supplies and Services required, including cost assumptions used to develop the budget for these costs.

Consultants:

3. Other Sources of Funding for this Project

Please describe your contingency plans if full project funding does not become available. Any significant expected in-kind contributions should be included in the space below.

4. Budgeted Costs for certain Key Activities

Please describe key activities and estimated costs (included in the line items above) for the applicable categories below, as described in the guidance for full proposal:

- gender
- youth (only for those who have a relevant set of activities in this area)
- capacity development
- impact assessment
- intellectual asset management
- open access and data management
- communication

5. Other

Please feel free to use this section to provide any other commentary or information that helps to describe and justify the budget request presented. This may include assumptions and rationale behind indirect costs, risks, anomalies or other assumptions Reviewers should be aware of when reviewing the budget.

Annex 3.3 – Performance Indicator Matrix for Full Proposals

Instead of one complex excel file, we propose three simpler tables:

<u>Table short description</u>		<u>Purpose of the table:</u>
① @ CRP Level: contribution to the 2022 CGIAR targets	➔	Assess overall V4M of CGIAR portfolio
② @ Flagship level: outcomes by windows of funding	➔	Assess what W1+W2 money can buy
③ @ Flagship level: level of investments by subIDOs	➔	Assess the qualitative contribution to the SRF, including crosscutting themes

Example – Table 1 @ CRP level: contribution to the 2022 CGIAR Targets

SLO Target number	Quantitative Contribution to SLO Targets 2022	Quantitative contributions by Countries				Financial resources needed ⁽¹⁾				Synergies with other CRPs ⁽²⁾
		Kenya	Bangladesh	Uganda	Other	Total	W1+W2	W3	Bilateral	
Reduced Poverty – target 1	10M farm households	5	4	1		\$10M	25%	5%	70%	CRP X CRP Y CRP Z
Reduced Poverty – target 2	20M individuals	10	5	5						

(1) estimated amount, it is not expected to be auditable; Base budget scenario only; Exclude crosscutting investments (capacity building, gender & youth, climate change, policies & institutions)

(2) A list of potential CRPs with whom collaboration is expected on this specific SLO/target

Example – Table 2 @ Flagship level: outcomes by windows of funding

Climate Smart Varieties (Total investment amount \$30M)

2022 Outcome Description ⁽¹⁾	Amount Needed ⁽²⁾	W1+W2 (%)	W3 (%)	Bilateral (%)
high-yielding and resistant populations adapted to targeted environments available	\$10M	70% (\$7M)		30% (\$3M)
20,000,000 people (4,000,000 HH), of which 50% are women, increased their annual income by increasing sales and diversifying market strategies	\$20M	30% (\$6M)	5% (\$1M)	65% (\$13M)

(1) A supporting narrative with the outputs by year to be provided in the proposal narrative. The 2022 outcomes represent the end of the path, what the collection of activities and outputs would add up to. Suggested that there would be 3 to 5 outcomes per flagship at the most.

(2) Estimates only. These numbers are not expected to be auditable.

Example – Table 3 @ Flagship level: investments by sub-IDOs

Climate Smart Varieties (Total investment amount \$30M)

SubIDO Name	Amount Needed ⁽²⁾	W1+W2 (%)	W3 (%)	Bilateral (%)
<u>SLOs related</u>				
Enhanced Genetic Gain	\$20M	50% (\$10M)		50% (\$10M)
<u>Crosscutting</u>				
Improved capacity for women and young to participate in decision making	\$10M	30% (\$3M)	10% (\$1M)	60% (\$6M)

(1) Estimates only. These numbers are not expected to be auditable.