

**Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH)
Independent Advisory Committee (IAC) Meeting
IFPRI, Washington, D.C.
October 21-22, 2015**

Summary of Recommendations, Comments, and Action Items

Introduction

The Independent Advisory Committee (IAC), the Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) flagship leaders, the A4NH program management unit (PMU), and the International Food Policy Research Institute's (IFPRI) Director General's Office met on October 21-22, 2015, at IFPRI headquarters in Washington, D.C. for their fourth annual meeting. A list of participants and the agenda can be found at the end of this summary. Robert Paarlberg chaired the meeting.

The purpose of the IAC is to provide independent advice to the IFPRI Director General, the IFPRI Board, and to the A4NH Director on the following issues: program strategy; plans of work and budget; research quality, relevance, and innovation; monitoring and evaluation; potential for outcomes and impacts; and other advice relative to the strategy, implementation, and performance of the program.

Meeting objectives

1. To review the CRP Commissioned External Evaluation (CCEE) recommendations
2. To discuss and propose action plans for:
 - a. Future role of the IAC in Phase 2 of A4NH
 - b. Managing A4NH and Center relations
3. To provide advice on the Phase 2 proposal development
4. To comment on 2015 progress and the 2016 POWB (Plan of Work and Budget)

This document summarizes the IAC's **recommendations** and **key comments**. A list of **action items** is included at the end of this document.

Recommendations

At the end of the meeting, the IAC made recommendations to the A4NH Director covering five areas.

Number of flagships in the Phase II A4NH portfolio

Some IAC members thought A4NH should reduce the number of proposed flagships from the six that were proposed in the pre-proposal (1-Biofortification, 2-Food Safety, 3-Food Systems for Healthier Diets, 4-Improving Human Health, 5-Integrated Programs to Improve Nutrition, and 6-Supporting Country Outcomes through Research on Enabling Environments) to either four or five flagships, by combining Food Safety with Improving Human Health and/or combining Integrated Programs to Improve Nutrition with Supporting Country Outcomes through Research on Enabling Environments. The IAC understands there are transaction costs for introducing the change at this point. Although they respect and admire the vision of the proposed portfolio, the IAC wanted the A4NH Director to hear the signals from the external stakeholders (the external evaluation and the ISPC) regarding a need for clear focus. Endless expansion does not look prudent in this funding environment. A4NH should be working toward a large portfolio of impacts, not just multiple flagships. The IAC was not united on the subject of flagship

numbers, but recommended that the A4NH Director do what is necessary to implement the vision, carefully considering what can be managed in a disciplined way and funded for impact.

The IAC reported that they had an extensive discussion about whether Improving Human Health and Food Safety should be separate flagships. If they are to remain separate, then strong leadership of Improving Human Health will be very important. The flagships on Integrated Programs to Improve Nutrition and Supporting Country Outcomes through Research on Enabling Environments are both strong areas of IFPRI's work and will both attract significant bilateral funding. Some IAC members found that separating the two areas made it confusing about what impacts the two were trying to achieve.

Recruitment of new flagship leaders

For two of the proposed flagships – Food Systems for Healthier Diets and Improving Human Health – new flagship leaders will be jointly recruited by A4NH and the respective external partners, Wageningen UR and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. The IAC indicated they did not have enough information during this meeting about how far along A4NH and its partners were in the recruitment process in order to give any specific recommendations. Instead, they suggested that a lot of management input and advice be taken into account during the recruitment process, as their experience has shown that managing a recruitment process with more than one partner will be difficult and time consuming. Their advice was to start planning for recruitment as soon as possible.

Implementing the CRP Commissioned External Evaluation (CCEE) recommendation on science quality and research management

One of the recommendations from the CCEE was around the issue of 'Science quality and research management.' Specifically, the recommendation was: *Adopt CGIAR standards of research quality as soon as these become available. In the meantime, set out clear expectations of the minimum research management processes required for all A4NH-supported research, making reference to these in key contractual agreements (e.g., PPAs), research program strategies, and in the Phase II proposal.* The further recommendation was that: *A4NH should require Centers to adequately document all research projects supported by A4NH, showing what science quality processes have been followed. This would apply both to core A4NH research and that supported under the A4NH wider 'value added' program.*

The evaluation team found that the biggest areas for concern were around process (e.g., ethical review), which is primarily the responsibility of the Centers conducting the research, not necessarily A4NH. CGIAR has never instituted a centralized process for setting quality standards for scientific processes and does not monitor activities. Nevertheless, the IAC emphasized this was an important concern from the CCEE. They supported A4NH's plan to issue formal guidance and guidelines on minimum standards for the Centers participating in A4NH (as stated in the management response to CCEE). In addition, they suggested one role of A4NH could be to focus on building capacity among Centers in this area. They encouraged A4NH to access an IRB in one of the Centers to assist Centers without an IRB to review studies involving human subjects.

A related issue that was raised by the IRB was on policies/standards/strategies for dissemination of research and how dissemination of research results was monitored by A4NH. The suggestion was that by actively disseminating research results beyond traditional means (e.g., journal publications), governments or 'non traditional' research institutions could become more interested in funding agriculture, nutrition and health research. Relatedly, it might also be wise for A4NH to monitor how research results generate new funding for projects.

The issue of boundaries was highlighted by the CCEE and discussed by the IAC. There are activities and research that are agreed priorities by CGIAR that can only be supplied by A4NH and have important Window 1/Window 2 (W1/W2) funding from CGIAR, and there are activities that are related to A4NH goals, but are funded bilaterally and are 'mapped' to A4NH by Centers. This is where the terms used in the CCEE emerged to refer to the former activities/research as 'core' and the latter as 'value added.' The 'value added' activities are more related to the results framework where A4NH support is critical and it works with other CRPs. The IAC noted that moving forward, A4NH would need to more clearly identify and communicate its 'core research' and develop a more explicit plan for how it will manage the activities and research that occur outside this 'core' boundary. This point relates to managing science quality and is further elaborated in a section under Key Comments.

Transitioning the Independent Advisory Committee (IAC) to the Independent Steering Committee (ISC)

Another one of the recommendations from the CCEE was to strengthen A4NH governance. The CCEE report identified a governance gap between the IFPRI Board of Trustees and the IAC, noting that neither body has time or resources for detailed oversight of A4NH. CGIAR has made a similar observation and has come up with their own solution. Starting in Phase II, all CRPs will all follow similar governance and management arrangements. One part of this new system will be an Independent Steering Committee (ISC). The ISC will have both programmatic and fiduciary responsibilities of A4NH, unlike the IAC which has had an advisory role during Phase 1 of A4NH.

The IAC recognized that operating as an ISC will require changes. Conflicts of interest and potential conflicts of interest are a real issue for the group as it is currently composed. The IAC had concerns about how they could maintain their current membership if their responsibilities shifted into formal review and approval of plans of work and budgets. Several IAC members perceived real conflicts of interest if they were to transition into an ISC; other IAC members perceived that the institutions represented fostered synergies instead of conflicts of interest.

The IAC recognized that the new responsibilities of an ISC would require resources to cover the additional time demands. The IAC made some practical suggestions for the A4NH Director to consider, such as dividing the typical IAC agenda into four parts (across quarterly meetings) might make it more manageable for members to prepare for and would allow the committee to address issues as they arise throughout the year. If the A4NH Director needs more time and advice from the committee members, it might be advisable to have one or two subcommittees on different issues. Other issues they hoped would be addressed before the transition included a formal terms of service for the ISC members, and clearer guidance on who would appoint ISC members, their replacements, and the ISC chair. Precedents within CGIAR will be important to take into consideration as the details of the A4NH ISC are clarified.

Without adequate information about its terms of service, without meeting more than once a year, and without more input from other A4NH participating CGIAR Centers, the IAC did not feel comfortable making the transition to the new ISC as they are currently. Because this transition does not have to be complete until 2017, the IAC felt they had time to see if they could get comfortable with working as an ISC. Their recommendation to the A4NH Director would be to maintain their same responsibilities in 2016, but conduct a 'dry run' to see what it would be like to fulfill the responsibilities of an ISC and how they could shape its design so it remains focused on providing substantive advice to the program. The 'dry run' in 2016 would likely include (1) review and approval of the plan of work and budget in January; (2) review and approval of major program submissions, such as the Phase 2 full proposal in March and external evaluations (TBD); (3) inputs on the recruitment process for the new flagship leaders; and (4)

assistance on developing details on the transition from an IAC to an ISC near the end of 2016 . The time commitments would expand to include 1 to 3 virtual meetings plus the annual face-to-face meeting.

Gender

This year, there was not a separate presentation on gender research but instead each flagship leader mentioned the gender issues being addressed in the flagship. Some IAC members commented that A4NH should take a more holistic approach to its gender research, extending to other household members beyond women. There are a number of A4NH projects looking at how gender roles affect the allocation of labor, income, and so on, but perhaps the way gender research is presented in the future could be improved so that it is clearer. On the other hand, a number of projects on improving child nutrition primarily collect data on maternal nutrition (vs paternal nutrition), so admittedly, in some cases, it is a bias.

Key Comments

The IAC chair noted, as a personal observation, that a great deal of this year's meeting was preoccupied with CGIAR dysfunction and processes, instead of talking about A4NH research.

A4NH Phase 2 portfolio. The IAC noted that the external evaluation team and the ISPC have expressed concerns that A4NH may be losing its focus from core responsibilities and core capacity. The IAC appreciated the distinction between 'core research' and 'value added activities,' language which was originally proposed in the CRP Commissioned External Evaluation (CCEE) report and has been adopted in the A4NH pre-proposal. The IAC noted that it looks forward to further development of the A4NH Phase 2 proposal with regard to a clear articulation of its strategy for managing A4NH 'core' research activities while at the same time providing opportunities for center-managed activities that relate to A4NH goals and objectives to be integrated with or networked into the larger A4NH research program. Other issues to consider as these descriptions evolve is CGIAR guidance on how Window 1/Window 2 (W1/W2) allocations should be made (e.g., W1/W2 for upstream research and bilateral funding for downstream research) and what 'value' A4NH is adding and at what level. The IAC agreed with suggestions that A4NH needs to draw boundaries around its work so it can be adequately funded and managed for impacts and science quality directly associated with its 'core' funding and how this will be distinguished from 'value added' research. These comments will be taken into consideration as A4NH develops the full proposal.

One of the main topics of this year's meeting was reactions to comments received from the CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC) on the A4NH pre-proposal and recommendations from the CGIAR Science, Programs and Partnerships Committee (SPPC). Flagship specific advice from the IAC was recorded (some as specific recommendations in the previous section of this report) and will be shared with the flagship writing teams as they develop the full proposal. More generally, the IAC recommended that A4NH consider other complementary activities and donor interests and commitments before the proposal is finalized in March 2016.

Youth. The new cross-cutting issue in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) calls for research on gender and youth. Similar to the rest of the pre-proposals, A4NH did not describe a detailed research agenda on youth. The ISPC has noted that the youth agenda for CGIAR needs more systematic support and development will take time.

Resource allocation. One thing that the IAC did not have time to discuss during the meeting was priority setting procedures for resource allocations of W1/W2 in 2016. Budget cuts are expected – John has told Centers to plan for 30% - and there needs to be mechanisms in place to guide how decisions are made.

Action Items

Topic	Action Item	Who	Timeline
Phase 2 of A4NH	- Compile and share IAC comments on pre-proposal with flagship writing teams	PMU	Nov 2015
	- Update IAC members on the outcome from the Fund Council meeting	PMU	Nov 2015
	- Review A4NH full proposal for Phase 2	IAC	Feb – Mar 2016
Plan of Work and Budget for 2016	- Discuss proposed criteria for resource allocation	PMU with IAC	Dec 2015
	- Review and approve plan of work and budget for 2016	IAC	Dec 2015 – Jan 2016
Transitioning IAC to ISC	- Develop proposed plan for the IAC's terms of service for 2016 (e.g., outline of annual agenda and meeting schedule)	PMU with IAC	Dec 2015
CCEE recommendations on science quality and research management	- Set out clear expectations of the minimum research management processes required for all A4NH-supported research, making reference to these in key contractual agreements (e.g., PPAs),	A4NH PMU	Aug 2015 – Mar 2016

List of Participants

INDEPENDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jeroen A. BORDEWIJK
Former Senior Vice President Supply Chain Excellence Program (retired), Unilever
Email: bordewijk.jeroen@gmail.com

S. Mahendra DEV
Director
Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research
Email: profmahendra@gmail.com

Ylva HILLBUR (ex-officio member)
Deputy Director General for Research
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
Email: Y.Hillbur@cgiar.org

Joyce KINABO
Professor Human Nutrition
Sokoine University of Agriculture
Email: joyce_kinabo@yahoo.com

Emmy SIMMONS
Former Assistant Administrator
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
Email: emmysimmons@aol.com

Inge D. BROUWER
Assistant Professor, Food and Nutrition Security
Division of Human Nutrition, Wageningen University
Email: inge.brouwer@wur.nl

Shenggen FAN (ex-officio member)
Director General
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: s.fan@cgiar.org

Mahabub HOSSAIN
Advisor to the Interim Executive Director
Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)
Email: hossain.mahabub@brac.net

Robert PAARLBERG (IAC chair)
Betty Freyhof Johnson '44 Professor of Political Science
Wellesley College
Email: rpaarlbe@wellesley.edu

FLAGSHIP LEADERS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Howarth BOUIS
Program Director, HarvestPlus
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: h.bouis@cgiar.org

Delia GRACE
Team Leader, Animal Health Food Safety & Zoonoses Markets, Gender and Livelihoods
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
Email: d.grace@cgiar.org

Marie RUEL
Division Director, Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: m.ruel@cgiar.org

Alan DE BRAUW
Senior Research Fellow, Markets, Trade and Institutions Division
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: a.debrauw@cgiar.org

Maya RAJASKHARAN
Head of Program Coordination
International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
Email: r.rajaskharan@cgiar.org

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT UNIT

Mysbah BALAGAMWALA
Research Analyst, A4NH
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: m.balagamwala@cgiar.org

Nancy JOHNSON
Research Fellow, A4NH
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: n.johnson@cgiar.org

Tigist DEFABACHEW
Contract & Grants Administrator/Sr. Admin. Coordinator, A4NH
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: t.defabachew@cgiar.org

Kimberly KEETON
Communications Specialist II, A4NH and PHND
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Email: k.keeton@cgiar.org

<p>Hazel MALAPIT Gender Research Coordinator, A4NH International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: h.malapit@cgiar.org</p> <p>Amanda WYATT Program Manager, A4NH International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: a.wyatt@cgiar.org</p>	<p>John MCDERMOTT Director, A4NH International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: j.mcdermott@cgiar.org</p>
IFPRI DIRECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE	
<p>Rajul PANDYA-LORCH Head 2020 Vision Initiative and Chief of Staff International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: r.pandya-lorch@cgiar.org</p>	<p>Stacy ROBERTS Head of Donor Relations; Secretary to the Board of Trustees International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: s.roberts@cgiar.org</p>
OTHER ATTENDEES	
<p>Namukolo COVIC Research Coordinator International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: n.covic@cgiar.org</p> <p>Deanna OLNEY Senior Research Fellow International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: d.olney@cgiar.org</p>	<p>Jef LEROY Senior Research Fellow International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: j.leroy@cgiar.org</p> <p>Amy SALTZMAN Senior Program Analyst, HarvestPlus International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Email: a.saltzman@cgiar.org</p>

**CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition & Health - A4NH
Independent Advisory Committee Meeting
October 21-22, 2015 - IFPRI, Washington, DC**

Conference Room 7AB- 7th Floor

Chair: Robert Paarlberg

Purpose: The Independent Advisory Committee (IAC) provides independent advice to the IFPRI Director General, the IFPRI Board, and to the A4NH Director and Planning and Management Committee on the following:

1. The overall Program portfolio and resource allocation.
2. Program milestones, outputs and outcomes for quality and relevance and how these are being monitored and evaluated.
3. Program impact pathway, progress in achieving these and progress in assessing impacts. Provide advice on partnerships needed to accelerate and broaden impacts.
4. Planning and implementation for gender, partnerships, capacity development and communications. Provide advice on program management.
5. Research priorities and quality of science. Advise on needs for external review or support for the program's research as appropriate. Advice on adjustments to the research plans of the program. Provide advice on scientific partnerships.
6. Promoting the program within different networks and to partners and donors.
7. The quality, relevance and performance of the program.

Objectives of the Meeting:

1. To review the CRP Commissioned External Evaluation Recommendations
2. To discuss and propose action plans for:
 - a. Future IAC Roles
 - b. Managing Partner Center - A4NH relations
3. To provide advice on proposal development, specifically
 - a. Overall CRP level
 - b. Flagships
4. To comment on 2015 progress and the 2016 POWB (Plan of Work and Budget)

The IAC will discuss their recommendations for A4NH with the group and produce a short document on their guidance.

Wednesday, October 21, 2015		
<u>Session 1</u> 2:00 - 2:30 pm (30 min)	Welcome and Opening Remarks Welcome and Opening Remarks Introduction and actions from last meeting	Shenggen Fan, DG of IFPRI Robert Paarlberg ,IAC Chair John McDermott, A4NH
<u>Session 2</u> 2:30 - 3:30 pm (30 min)	Center Commissioned External Review findings and recommendations looking forward to Phase II	
(30 min)	Presentation of Main Findings	Julia Compton, Team Leader
(30 min)	Questions and Answers	All participants
<u>Session 3</u> 3:30 - 4:30 pm (60 min)	Discussion on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evolution of IAC members' roles and responsibilities in 2016 and beyond (Rec 8) - led by Robert Paarlberg Managing Partner Center - A4NH relations (Recs 4-5 and CGIAR Internal Audit Unit review) - Mahendra Dev and Ylva Hillbur 	Robert Paarlberg (Chair)
<u>Session 4</u> 4:30 - 5:45 pm (75 min)	Introducing the pre-proposal and comments received followed by Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief overview of the pre-proposal comments received and likely requirements for the full proposal. General discussion with IAC members Budget update for 2015-2016 	John McDermott
5:45 - 6:00 pm (15 min)		
6:00 - 7:30 pm	RECEPTION AT THE 4 TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM AB	
Thursday, October 22, 2015		
8:00 - 8:30 am	LIGHT BREAKFAST	
<u>Session 5</u> (180 min) 8:30 - 10:30 am 11:00 - 12:00 am	Planning for Flagship Development for the Full Proposal - approximately 30 minutes per flagship	IAC members as discussants and FP leaders and PMC as respondents
10:30 - 11:00 am	COFFEE BREAK	
<u>Session 6</u> 12:00 pm - 1:00 pm (60 min)	Highlights from 2015 and priorities for 2016 and Budget and Planning for 2016	FP leaders presents Hazel Malapit Resource person on Gender
1:00 to 3:00 pm (120 min)	LUNCH AND IAC MEMBERS ONLY DISCUSSION	
<u>Session 7</u> 3:00 - 4:00 pm (60 min)	IAC members' comments and discussion of their recommendations	
<u>Session 8</u> 4:00 to 4:30 pm (30 min)	Wrap-up and next steps	
For afternoons - Coffee, tea and snacks will be available in the room		