

A photograph of a man in a small boat, wearing a light-colored long-sleeved shirt and blue shorts, pulling a large fishing net from the water. He is leaning forward, holding the net with both hands. The net is filled with catch and is draped over the side of the boat. In the background, another person is visible in a boat further out on the water under a clear sky.

Criteria for resource allocation

ISPC Workshop 9 May 2017 Amsterdam



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

Structure

- What we did to assess the ‘quality’ of Phase II CRP proposals
- Update on work with the System to reach a common understanding of what ‘quality’ means in the context of CGIAR Research for Development
- Voting on the importance of specific criteria

Quote from Guidance Notes for Call

'A coherent set of interconnected 2017-2022 pre-proposals to address the selected global challenges identified in CGIAR's 2016 – 2030 SRF'



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

CRP pre-proposal: what ISPC looked at – CRP level

- Strategic relevance and question/problem to be addressed
 - (a) alignment with the SRF including the significance of gender for successfully addressing the strategic problem;
 - (b) the added value of being a program, i.e. degree of cohesion across flagships;
 - (c) strategy for ensuring that international public goods are delivered, Theory of Change and Impact Pathways
- Evidence of demand
- Comparative advantage of the CGIAR together with proposed partners in delivering in specified research areas (including lessons learnt from earlier research)
- Strategic fit and relevance of partnerships
- Stakeholder commitment e.g. include reference to the SDGs
- Leadership, management and governance structure and proposed activities

Criteria used by ISPC for Science Quality - Flagship level

- Novelty and soundness of the research being proposed;
- Track record of the FP leadership and team, assessed on the basis of what was achieved in the previous CRP portfolio (publications and demonstration of commitment to quality, peer review mechanisms, etc.);
- Lessons learned; evidence of building on previous work (1st round of CRPs); e.g. how things have changed or even been dropped on the basis of past learning.



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

Criteria for reviewing CRPs (12 in total)

1. Overall analysis as an integral part of the CRP portfolio

- **Strategic relevance:** is there a compelling argument or sufficient evidence that the CRP as a whole will make a significant contribution to delivery at the CGIAR system level?
- Consideration of the '**grand challenges**', in particular climate change, in appropriate flagship projects;
- Evidence of capturing **inter-CRP synergies** and at the CRP cluster in which the CRP takes part (agri-food system or integrative CRP); In particular,
 - (For 'agri-food-system' CRPs) Does the CRP adopt an integrated approach to advancing productivity, sustainability and resilience?
 - (For integrative CRPs) Does the CRP plan to work with the eight agri-food systems CRPs and how does it conceptualise the integration across the whole portfolio?
- **Rigor and credibility** of the scientific arguments underpinning the rationale for the proposal;
- Individual FPs add up to a CRP that offers more value than the sum of individual FPs.
- **Lessons learned** from previous research and earlier external reviews and recommendations (including **ISPC comments and recommendations on pre-proposals**) have been adequately considered and factored in the full proposal.
- **Site integration:** The CRP demonstrates how it intends to work on key site integration plans, i.e., the steps taken and will be taken?



Independent
Science and
Partnership
Council

Criteria continued

2. Theory of change and impact pathway(s)
3. Cross-cutting themes: gender, youth, enabling environment, capacity development
4. Budget
5. Leadership and partnership

'Quality' Working Group

- Started as Quality of Science
- Changed to Quality of Research for Development to recognise multiple criteria
- Workshop involved representatives from different constituencies across the System including Board Science Committees and CRP Steering Committees as well as Center DDG-Rs and CRP leaders and included input from an external panel
- Consultation document sent round to constituencies and still waiting for feedback

4 Elements of QoR4D agreed - 1

Relevance refers to the importance, significance and usefulness of the research objectives, processes and findings to the problem context and to society, and CGIAR's comparative advantage to address the problems. It incorporates strategic stakeholder engagement along the AR4D continuum, explicit impact pathways, original and socially relevant research aligned to national and regional priorities, as well as the CGIAR SRF and SDGs. It also recognizes the importance of International Public Goods (IPGs).

4 Elements of QoR4D agreed - 2

Scientific credibility implies that the research findings are robust and sources of knowledge are dependable and sound. This includes clear demonstration of data adhering to FAIR data principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) and the methods used to procure the data, and clearly presented and logical interpretation of findings. It also recognizes the importance of good scientific practice such as peer review and accommodates problem-oriented inter- and transdisciplinary approaches.

4 Elements of QoR4D agreed - 3

Legitimacy means that the research process is fair and ethical and perceived as such. This encompasses the ethical and fair representation of all involved and consideration of interests and perspectives of intended users. It suggests transparency/lack of conflict of interest, recognition of responsibilities that go with public funding, genuine recognition of partners' contributions as well as partnerships built on trust.

4 Elements of QoR4D agreed - 4

Effectiveness signifies that research generates knowledge, products and services that stimulate actions that address the problem and contribute to solutions and innovations. It incorporates dynamic theories of change underpinned by assumptions for how change happens for effects to occur. It takes into consideration negative unintended consequences of research, appropriate implementation and effective communication. It also relates to leadership, capacity development and a supportive enabling environment for quality research.

Additional criteria – as used in the Review

Comparative Advantage

Included whether the CGIAR has a competitive advantage in this area (i.e. taking price relative to other suppliers into account) or has included partners to complement its own skills.

Cross-cutting issues

The SRF highlights the importance of embedding gender, climate change and capacity development issues into the research design

Additional criteria – as used in the Review

Delivery of development outcomes

The SRF included quantified targets for development outcomes and each CRP proposal included targets. These cannot be delivered by CRPs, but the review takes account of whether the partnership strategy is convincing and evidence of 'demand' from users is presented

Cohesion

This was asked for both in the SRF and the Guidance document both within a CRP and across CRPs. The question asked was whether the whole was bigger than the sum of the parts. Yet donors took decisions at the FP level.

Voting on this will help inform the ISPC and the SMB of current donor interest in having programs and a portfolio vs a collection of Flagships