

Minutes of the 7th GLDC-IAC Virtual Meeting

Date: 12 April 2021

Time: 4:00 to 6:00 PM (IST)

Venue: BlueJeans Video Conference

Attendance

S. No.	Name	Role in GLDC-IAC
1	Dr Etienne Hainzelin, Advisor to the President of CIRAD and Visiting Professor EDIM, University of Ottawa	Chair
2	Dr Jacqueline Hughes, Director General, ICRISAT	Member
3	Dr David Chikoye, Director, Regional Hub for Southern Africa, IITA	Member
4	Dr Ravi Prabhu, Deputy Director General – Research, ICRAF	Member
5	Dr Jacques Wery, Deputy Director General – Research, ICARDA	Member
6	Dr Herve Thieblemont, Regional Seed Business Development Lead, Asia and Mekong region Director, Syngenta Foundation	Member
7	Dr Michael Battaglia, Research Director, Agriculture And Global Change, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Member
8	Dr Mariame Maiga, Regional Adviser Gender and Social Development, West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development CORAF/WECARD	Member
9	Dr Jane Ininda, Head of Seed Research and Systems Development, AGRA	Member
10	Dr Geoffrey Heinrich, Senior Technical Advisor, Agriculture Livelihoods and Environment, Catholic Relief Services	Member
11	Dr Kiran Sharma, Director, CRP-GLDC	Secretary, IAC

Apologies

1	Dr Uma Sah, Principal Scientist (Agcl. Extension), ICAR-Indian Institute of Pulses Research (IIPR)	Member
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

Special invitees

1	Dr Andrew Hall, CSIRO	Focal Person, Cross-cutting theme on Markets and Partnerships in Agri-Business (MPAB)
2	Dr Jummai Yila, ICRISAT	Focal Person, Cross-cutting theme on Gender & Youth
3	Dr Jules Bayala, ICRAF	Leader, FP3: Integrated Farm and Household management

The following agenda items were discussed:

1. Welcome and Introduction

Etienne Hainzelin, Chair, welcomed the IAC members. The Chair opened the meeting and the agenda of the meeting was adopted by the IAC.

The minutes of the 6th GLDC-IAC meeting, which was held on 15-16 October 2020, were endorsed by the IAC.

2. Update on CRP-GLDC

Kiran Sharma provided an update on the progress made since the last meeting in October 2020. The presentation covered the following topics:

- [Plan of Work and Budget \(POWB\) 2021](#)
- Annual Report 2020 & Highlights
- [GLDC Youth Strategy](#)
- [Revision of the Theory of Change](#) (ToC)

Kiran Sharma mentioned that 2021 being the final year of the CRPs, no carry-over of unspent funds will be permitted beyond 2021 to future years. All CRPs have been advised to fully implement the funds available to them, including unspent W1/2 funds from prior years. Otherwise, all unspent funds will have to be returned to the CGIAR Trust Fund by 31 March 2022. Accruals up to US\$ 60,000 related to issuing the final CRP reports by 30 April 2022 have been permitted by the System Management Office (SMO).

IAC agreed/supported with the conclusions drawn in the revision of the GLDC Theory of Change (ToC):

- A post-CRP R4D program should be recommended to achieve the agri-food systems' transformation through a scaling process and sustaining the solutions generated by the first impact pathway
- Post-CRP phase should focus on solving market, business and distributional challenges

IAC recommended that the revised ToC should be shared with the SMO for their considering while implementing the One CGIAR research strategy. IAC also suggested to publish the survey conducted for the Youth Strategy.

IAC deliberated on the possibility of continuing with the existing GLDC partnerships and suggested that it is worth exploring how to continue with the GLDC legacy beyond the CRPs, especially focusing on strengthening and upgrading value chains and development of markets.

3. Special session: Work Plan for implementing the IAC recommendations

The IAC recommendations are given in annexure-1 and the work plan in annexure-2. The following GLDC staff were invited to present their work plan for the implementation of the IAC recommendations made in the IAC meeting held during 15-16 October 2020:

- Dr Andrew Hall, Focal Person, Markets and Partnerships in Agri-Business (MPAB)
- Dr Jummai Yila, Focal Person, Gender & Youth
- Dr Jules Bayala, Leader, FP3: Integrated Farm and Household management

Discussion Points:

Presentation 1: Cross-cutting: Markets and Partnerships in Agri-Business (MPAB) by Andrew Hall

The presentation covered 4 IAC recommendation deliverables:

- i. A discussion paper on agri-food systems vs food system concepts and implications for the CGIAR.
- ii. Deepening an evidence base and developing a new impact narrative based on GLDC experience.
- iii. A position paper on the what if FP2 case.
- iv. A communication strategy to leverage influence from the above.

The presentation emphasized two points.

A systems framing. There is an increasing use of systems framing of food and nutritional security challenges and accompanying this is the increasing interest in “systems transformation” as a heuristic to reformat principles and approaches to innovation. This perspective has implications for how the CGIAR operates and informs MPAB’s analysis of past experiences and future directions.

Different innovation pathways. Analysis of case studies and current thinking on systems transformation suggests two contrasting pathways through which market-driven opportunities can be pursued; (i) A business as usual end of the pipeline approach to market where problems are framed and technology choices made before engaging partners to scale technology options, and (ii) A responsive, mission-oriented approach where a convening process is used to collectively frame problems and make technology choices, thus laying the ground work for an engaged set of stakeholders to enable innovation that is aligned to their interests and agreed goals. Both approaches have risks and rewards and don’t present an “either/or case”, but suggest different pathways that are needed for different challenges. Case study evidence suggests that BAU often fails because of inappropriate problem framing and the difficulty of attracting and sustaining market and political buy-in support, with interventions failing to scale beyond pilot projects. However, lessons learnt from work on adoption processes with FP 4 suggests that having a pipeline / menu of robust varieties available (irrespective of market signals) can be critical when new agri-food systems / market opportunities unexpectedly emerge. The responsive mode is better aligned to the systemically framed “grand challenges” articulated by current food and nutritional security debates and the SDGs more generally. It does however, present organisational challenges associated with the need to embed CGIAR science in broader change processes and questions about how (and by who) coalitions of interest can be convened to set new directions and safeguard the continued alignment to “grand challenge” goals.

Discussion points

There is a degree of urgency around this work (and its communication) due to the fast-paced development of the One CGIAR and the implications this work may have for future programming. It was suggested that the “what if FP2” paper that articulates the two pathways is most urgent. It was agreed that a draft would be ready by June 2021.

The discussion on two pathways should be done in such a way so as to help make choices about the pathway to be selected? The more detailed discussion of the two pathways above gives some explanation of this. The core choice is about the nature of the problems being addressed. If the CGIAR focuses increasingly on complex “grand challenges”, then a more responsive mission orientated approach seems promising. It was also pointed out that

“grand challenges” are not going to be resolved by production technology alone (the comparative advantage of the CGIAR) and therefore a wider set of technologies and technology partners that will need to be enrolled in addition to other agri-food system stakeholders. Overall, it was agreed that this diagnostic dimension of the discussion of the two pathways should be made explicit in the paper.

How will the findings be shared and socialised with other Flagship Programs? As in work on adoption process currently been conducted with FP4, it was suggested that mini workshop with scientist across the FPs would be a useful way forward.

What does this (the system transformation perspective) mean for technology adoption by small holder? Clearly, this is a very big question. What our work on, for example, major food policy changes in Kenya in relation to flour blending informs us that even when a promising system perturbation takes place in agri-food systems, there is no guarantee that this will benefit smallholder and provide them incentives for technical change. This work suggests that additional institutional innovations such as “smallholder procurement” regulations will be needed to ensure the directionality of change addresses “grand challenges”. This points to the old chestnut that innovation almost inevitably involves technological as well as institutional changes. This is particularly so in the realm of system transformation where the innovation task is as much about adapting the performance of the system (e.g., emergent services such as poverty reduction or food and nutritional security) as it is about component technologies.

Why are we thinking just about change related to GLDC commodities and not about change in farming systems and the integration of different crops (and livestock)? Farming system dynamic are more of an FP3 domain of interest. However, the point does consider the issue of organisational imperatives that drive crop/ commodity advocacy. The systems transformation agenda suggest the needed for “grand challenges” advocacy, or at least collective problem framing around these challenges. As mentioned earlier, this raises unresolved organisational challenges on how commodity-orientated research can be best mobilised towards a transformational agenda.

Presentation 2: Cross-cutting: Gender & Youth by Jummai Yila

Comment from the Chairman: It is good to see gender-disaggregated data and analysis with a significant difference in male and female respondents' crop trait preferences.

Comment from Mariame Maiga: This is a great job and presentation of the gender and youth work being done. The activities on the training of women and youths on small-scale seed business development, postharvest handling, and marketing techniques of improved groundnut varieties in Mali is very nice and also strategic, because this is how the GLDC can support agribusiness development for empowerment. There is need to see how this type of activities can be up-/out-scaled, emphasizing on developing these kinds of activities with training will definitely fast-track the empowerment of women and youth. We may also come up with additional support to see how the development of agribusiness for empowerment can be enhanced.

Response: Thank you for these very good comments and recognition of the achievements of the Gender and youth inclusion team. In terms of how we can be strategic to ensure women and youth have access to GLDC technologies and innovations, the team is going about this with a step at a time. The scale and number of strategic intervention activities are determined by the budget allocation. However, in partnership with World Food Program (WFP) the West and Central Africa Research program of ICRISAT is currently developing and implementing a gender empowerment strategy to increase food production and reduce

poverty among the most vulnerable population. This is being implemented through mapping and designing capacity-building plans in targeted communities as processing units for the production and utilization of smart foods. We look forward to having additional resources to upscale the reach of such novel initiatives.

Question from Mariame Maiga: I am concerned with the way gender progress is being tracked during the implementation of the program. For instance, to date, what is the number or percentage of women and youth targeted in terms of production and access? What is the target met as beneficiaries in terms of access to technologies and innovations, capacity building, etc.? The Flagships presented the target met, but in your presentation, I was expecting to see how many targeted women and men beneficiaries that the program has managed to reach to date, to track the gender progress. You should have a figure ready from the tracking system to present.

Response: We would work with the MEL colleagues to have a ready figure or number and percentage of women targeted and those that benefited.

Presentation 3: FP3: Integrated Farm and Household management by Jules Bayala

Question on Partnerships

We have only eight months before the end of the CRP-GLDC without any clear action on how the activities would end. There are lots of Initiatives being discussed under One CGIAR context, but what you presented is going way beyond the One CGIAR. How do you see the capital of partnerships and current actions beyond 31 Dec 2021? How do you see the continuation of these partnerships?

Response: During the last Annual Meeting in November 2020, we discussed about developing a proposal on agro-ecological transformation of diet and livelihoods. We are pursuing that ideal so that the team is updating the concept note first and then we would take it from there. The intention is for the team to remain together and try to deepen the knowledge we have generated if we are not able to take to scale all the things developed by Dec 2021, we can go through the proposal and take to scale if we are able to raise funds. We are very happy with the partnerships we have developed, and we want to keep these ongoing for which the only way forward will be to have funds.

Comment on crop diversification: The presentation provided information on lots of activities – good progress to be realized before the end of the project. However, considering the farming systems, it is strongly driven by only one of the crops. We did not see many activities dealing with cereals, legumes, intercropping and crop rotation linked to markets. Because the market actors may not be the same in the cereals and legumes, it will be important to consider all the crops together and not separating them in farming systems.

Response: We grouped the activities for the sake of time. This is also to ease the synthesis of the activities and results for a publication. Under the participatory trials, we have several legumes, cereals including maize, millet and sorghum, we have rotation, intercropping and other activities including training and demonstration up to adoption.

Comments on One CGIAR Initiatives: There would be value to have conversations with the One CGIAR Initiatives as soon as possible and not at the end of the year, since we will have a good idea about the Initiatives by June 2021 or before. I don't see many references to the GLDC; about cereals and legumes. Lots of Initiatives that can benefit from GLDC in different flagships which could be a way to continue, e.g., Agrobiodiversity, Farmer Preferred Varieties under Genetic Innovation (GI), a good way to support and channel the key questions and lessons learned from the CRP into these initiatives.

Response: Comments are well taken. We will try to connect. As you know, some of us have not signed on to the One CGIAR and we are involved in several Initiatives showing that we have ways of getting connected. Besides, since some other institutions are in the OneCG, these activities, lessons learned, and results could be channelled to the Initiatives for continuation.

Wrap-up of Work Plan Session

IAC was pleased to note the progress made on its earlier recommendations and made no further recommendations. The chair thanked the special invitees for their presentations and suggested for a follow up session on the work plan in the next IAC meeting.

4. AOB

• One CGIAR

Kiran Sharma stated that no update is available on the One CGIAR as there haven't been any direct interaction with the CRPs. SMO has allowed US \$ 60 K to carry over to 2022 to continue with the PMU to complete the CRP-GLDC reports by 30 April 2022.

- Science Leaders meetings are being organised in April and June. The part one of the meeting on 23, 26 and 27 April will focus on the progress and status, synthesis and lessons, closure and sustainability in terms of how do we carry forward our assets? e.g., archiving/management of CRP websites etc. The part two of the meeting in June will deal with post-2021 research agenda.
- Jacqueline Hughes apprised the IAC of ICRISAT's decision not to join the unified governance of One CGIAR. However, ICRISAT will continue as a CGIAR Research Center, including being a One CGIAR research partner.

• IAC member vacancy (Replacement in lieu of Dr Devra Jarvis from Bioversity)

Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed in the meeting, and discussed later through email. It was decided that in view of the fact that only eight months of the current phase of CRP-GLDC remain, this vacant membership would not be filled and the existing IAC would continue its role till December 2021.

The chair suggested planning the next IAC meeting in the month of September or October to take an overall stock of the performance of the CRP-GLDC and consider its overall deliverables. Kiran Sharma mentioned that the PMU had plans to organise a face-to-face meeting with IAC, including RMC and the key partners. However, given the current COVID-19 situation, this plan seems uncertain, but the PMU will plan a two-day online meeting if an in-person meeting will not be possible.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Annexure-1

During the 6th IAC meeting held on 15-16 October 2020, IAC recognized the good progress made by the different FPs and the cross-cutting themes and made three recommendations to the GLDC team as a way forward to 2021 and beyond:

1. IAC considers that GLDC should develop several outputs between now and the first quarter of 2021 to ensure that One CGIAR takes cognizance of the results as the new research strategy is formulated. These outputs would include the three following papers, to be developed in a coordinated way:

- i. Agri-food system vs Food Systems Approach: A short paper that clarifies why we think use of the concept of ‘agri-food system’ (agricultural and food systems in interaction), is more appropriate under the circumstances, how it relates better to FSA and to One CGIAR strategic direction. This should be built on the cross-cutting MPAB experience, but endorsed consensually by GLDC, so the other FP leaders should contribute and possibly co-author this document.
- ii. Build a deeper body of evidence and develop a paper on agri-food innovation: If GLDC is going to have a systemic impact on the agri-food systems of target countries it will be because the Theory of Change is something they can adapt and adopt as part of their agriculture development plans. A key activity for resourcing for the last period should be to define the nature of impact pathways in agri-food system innovation with an emphasis on how GLDC/ CGIAR research and its partners could engage with these pathways and what this would mean for both research practice and future research agenda. MPAB has already made a start collating evidence of the role of market demand in the promotion of GLDC crops and questioning in a recent paper the ability of the market alone to create incentive for GLDC technology adoption and to translate opportunities into inclusive and sustainable outcome for small holders. There is also learning from FP6 that can help. The GLDC should build on this to achieve a stronger body of evidence and develop a foundational paper on agri-food innovation to drive simultaneously smallholder benefit, diet and environmental outcomes.
- iii. A short paper for internal purposes (e.g. final evaluation of GLDC) of the ‘what if’ case related to FP2 to make sure that insights from ‘what could have been’ from GLDC are not lost. MPAB could pull together its results, challenging some of the conventional wisdom on delivering equitable and sustainable products via the market. This would set out a different narrative of the possible transformations of agri-food systems through a mix of technology uptake, policies and practices to make sure the direction of these change processes targets specifically the smaller holder we wish to help. This would provide a different framing on how research generate changes for these targets as well as a synthesis of existing experiences of the programming designs and approaches that can be deployed to advance this perspective.
- iv. Communications and outreach to deliver outputs and outcomes during the last year: Consider a communication campaign, not just an event, to share significant insights and outcomes, including those mentioned above, based on a ‘client’ analysis as a basis for targeted communications on aspects related to GLDC outputs and outcomes.

These papers represent a significant research - and possibly publication - agenda that would require a substantial budget. IAC recommends that GLDC find ways to support this agenda, including with the mobilization of the innovation fund.

- 2. In FP3, and more globally in the CRP, IAC considers that there is a need to strengthen the assessment of the multiple benefits provided by the solutions and transformative pathways tested in GLDC, considering the whole cropping system and not limiting to a single technology.** This implies to identify and measure - in experiments, in surveys and in simulation - a set of sustainability criteria, which are then translated into measurable indicators. Land productivity (e.g. yield) is not sufficient and should be completed by efficiency analysis of other factors (water, Nitrogen, labour...) both in biophysical and in economic terms. Ecosystems services also offers a framework to derive some of these indicators that can be measured or simulated, although there may be a time dimension in most of them which is not easy to address on short term experimental or simulation studies. Some of these indicators are scale specific and others can be assessed across different scales (field, farm, landscape); some of them have to be assessed over time and for several years. The teams engaged in CRP-GLDC have the expertise to conduct this type of approach and to use it to design their proposals for future research programs.
- 3. The IAC recognizes the current efforts of GLDC on gender and youth inclusion and engagement activities but recommends that these efforts should be integrated with activities to increased access by women and youth to improved technologies.** Adoption of improved technologies by women will result in greater impacts on their livelihoods. The GLDC members should also take stock of GLDC results on gender and use this information to prepare the future research portfolio of the program.

Annexure-2

Work Plan 2021 for the implementation of the IAC Recommendations

List of deliverables planned in response to the IAC recommendations made during the online interactive session between the IAC Observers, FP Leaders and Cross-cutting Focal Points held on 15 and 16 October 2020:

IAC Recommendation	Output/Deliverable	Timeline	FP/CC Leader	GLDC Center	Email Address	Mobile Number	
MPAB							
1	Agri-food system vs Food Systems Approach: A short paper that clarifies why we think use of the concept of 'agri-food system' (agricultural and food systems in interaction), is more appropriate under the circumstances, how it relates better to FSA and to One CGIAR strategic direction.	Perspective paper. Working title: <u>Clarifying the implications of an agri-food system perspective for new directions in the CGIAR</u>	April 2021	Andrew Hall	CSIRO	Andrew.hall@csiro.au	+61 476852361
2	Build a deeper body of evidence and develop a paper on agri-food innovation	Evidence: 1. review report of FP6 experiences of market engagement. 2. Review of case studies of market	Evidence reviews: July 2021 Journal article: Dec 2021	Andrew Hall	CSIRO	Andrew.hall@csiro.au	+61 476852361

		<p>engagement for GLDC crops.</p> <p>3. Review of business development principles and enterprise funding approaches by commercial business development company</p> <p>Journal article: Working title: <u>Towards a new impact narrative for CGIAR research: concepts and evidence from GLDC</u></p>					
3	A short paper for internal purposes (e.g. final evaluation of GLDC) of the 'what if' case related to FP2	<p>Internal discussion paper. Working title: <u>Reflections on the potential of engaging with systems change in agri-food systems.</u></p>	July 2021	Andrew Hall	CSIRO	Andrew.hall@csiro.au	+61 476852361
4	Communications and outreach to deliver outputs and outcomes during the last year	<p>1. Development of a communication strategy for MPAB insights</p> <p>2. Development of briefing notes, blogs and PPP slide decks based on reports and analysis developed</p>	<p>1# April 2021</p> <p>2# Oct 2021</p>	Andrew Hall	CSIRO	Andrew.hall@csiro.au	+61 476852361

		<p>through activities 1,2 and 3</p> <p>3. Virtual seminar/ mini workshop with senior CGIAR stakeholders to share strategic insights</p>	3# Oct 2021				
FP3							
1	<p>In FP3, and more globally in the CRP, IAC considers that there is a need to strengthen the assessment of the multiple benefits provided by the solutions and transformative pathways tested in GLDC, considering the whole cropping system and not limiting to a single technology.</p>	<p>Recognizing this the FP3 team have developed a multidimensional framework for assessment of farming system sustainability considering productivity, economic, social, environmental and human well-being. We plan to develop two manuscripts on Assessment of multi-dimensional sustainability at farming systems and landscape scale level and impact of system level interventions on its sustainability. We also plan to launch an open access online tool for farming system sustainability assessment.</p>	December 2021	<p>Shalander Kumar and Quang Bao Le</p> <p>(Each cluster leader will contribute while assessing impact of farming systems interventions at the cluster level.)</p>	ICRISAT ICARDA (with ICRAF & IITA)		

Gender							
	<p>The IAC recognizes the current efforts of GLDC on gender and youth inclusion and engagement activities but recommends that these efforts should be integrated with activities to increased access by women and youth to improved technologies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender gaps in adoption and production of legume and cereal varieties • Contribute to case study on lentils in cross-CGIAR report entitled "GENDER-RESPONSIVE BREEDING: LEARNING FROM NOVEL INFORMATION ABOUT GENDER-DIFFERENTIATED PREFERENCES FOR VARIETAL TRAITS" • Training of Women and Youths on Small-Scale seed business development, postharvest handling and marketing techniques of Improved Groundnut varieties in Mali • Behaviour change interventions designed to incentivize choice of improved varieties and 	<p>March to November 2021</p>	<p>Jummai O. Yila</p>	<p>ICRISAT</p>	<p>j.o.yila@cgiar.org</p>	<p>+223 93007422</p>
				<p>Dina Najjar</p>	<p>ICARDA</p>	<p>D.Najjar@cgiar.org</p>	
				<p>Almamy Sylla</p>	<p>ICRISAT</p>	<p>A.Sylla@cgiar.org</p>	
				<p>Jummai O. Yila</p>	<p>ICRISAT</p>	<p>j.o.yila@cgiar.org</p>	
				<p>Almamy Sylla & Jummai O. Yila</p>	<p>ICRISAT</p>		

		<p>quality seed of cereals and legumes in place of 'informal sources' among rural women users</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Market research data collected and utilized to define gender-responsive customer profiles and guide crop improvement priorities					
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--