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Talk about two developments:

1. CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas

2. New CIP Strategy and Corporate Plan

- Focus on potential implications for SPHI
Main conclusion:

The changing CGIAR context is resulting in

- **Growing demand** for an SPHI-like mechanism; and

- **More specific expectations** of what such a mechanism should deliver.
• One of 15 integrated CGIAR Research Programs (CRP’s)

• Designed to increase the development impacts of CGIAR research work

• CRP’s on main crops and crop groups
• CRP’s on agricultural systems and strategic issues
Our crops

- Banana
- Plantain
- Cassava
- Potato
- Sweetpotato
- Yam
- Other R&T
Why Roots, Tubers and Bananas?

RTB crops share:
- Genetic complexity (> grains)
- Vegetative propagation, similar seed systems
- Perishability, bulkiness and post harvest/value chain options
- High potential: > yields & impacts
- Low profile: “women’s crops”
- Under-investment (!)
A broad alliance of research-for-development stakeholders and partners

Lead center:

Participating centers:

Global strategic partners: and others coming on board

Partners at regional and country levels: research, extension, private sector, civil society, policy.
The value proposition:

• Moving towards **impact on a larger scale**

• **Greater capacity** through long-term collaboration amongst a greater range of partners

• **Accelerating progress** through synergies across RTB crops
  • Address shared challenges through cross-crop research and development approaches
  • Realizing synergies with and between crop-specific research

➢ **faster progress, wider impacts, cost-effective solutions**
RTB program structure

Program purpose:

to exploit the underutilized potential of root, tuber, and banana crops for:
• improving nutrition and food security,
• increasing incomes, and
• fostering greater gender equity especially amongst the world’s poorest and most vulnerable populations.
Prioritizing and organizing our work

• ‘Flagship projects’ based on prioritization process
  • One flagship project is focused on OFSP

• Impact pathways as a main planning and evaluation tool
  • Linking research outputs to development outcomes
  • Using consistent sets of indicators and targets
  • Accountable for contributing to one Results Framework

• Preparing a balanced investment portfolio of research projects organized around the flagship projects
  • ‘quick wins’
  • medium term
  • long-term, strategic research
New opportunities for working together

1. Programmatic alignment of crop research agendas and approaches
   • improved dialogue on research objectives, methodologies
   • increased exchange of research results – stronger evidence base

2. Co-location of research areas / benchmark sites
   • within RTB project portfolio
   • between RTB and other CGIAR Research Programs (e.g. Humid Tropics, Dryland Systems)
   • complementary locations where it makes sense

3. Joint-up approaches to capacity building of NARS partners
   • Human resources; young scientists
   • Improving and sharing research facilities
New opportunities for working together

4. Funding of specific cross-cutting research activities (more than one RTB crop):

Current examples:

• *Tools for quantifying and managing diseases causing degeneration of planting material*
• *Enhanced risk assessment and surveillance of critical pests and diseases*
• *Modelling RTB-seed systems for improving seed related investments*
• *Identifying and quantifying yield gaps for increased production*
• *Capacity strengthening and learning: A needs assessment*
• *Implementing the RTB gender strategy*

5. Training of researchers and partners in cross-cutting issues:

• e.g. Gender Training, Kampala 21-23 Oct. 2013
CIP Strategic and Corporate Plan

- Under development (BoT November 2013)
- Update for next 10 years 2014 - 2023
- Aligning to the changing external environment
- Significant and deliberate overlap with RTB Program
- 5 Strategic Objectives (SO’s)
SO1: Combating micronutrient deficiency with resilient, nutritious sweetpotato

Target: By 2023, reach at least 15 million resource-poor households.
  • (subsuming SPHI targets)

Impacts: Improve diet quality by 20%, and increase crop income by 15%

Flagship product: Resilient, nutritious sweetpotato varieties
  • OFSP as “first wave” flagship

Strategic Objective 1: Research products to deliver Integrated Agriculture-Nutrition-Market Approach

- Resilient, nutritious OFSP varieties
- Accelerated breeding methods & tools
- Seed systems approaches, technologies and diagnostic tools
- Evidence base for nutrition & behavior change
- Options for sustainable intensification
- Models and technologies for upgrading OFSP value chains
- Partnership models & policy options for going to scale

Impact pathway:
- Outcomes
- Feedback loop

SO1
Combating micronutrient deficiency through resilient, nutritious sweetpotato
Scaling-up OFSP to reach 15 million households: Progression of countries towards greater impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Stage 1 (&lt;10,000 HH)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (&lt;200,000 HH)</th>
<th>Stage 3 (&gt;200,000 HH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current status</strong></td>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ghana, Madagascar, Nigeria, Rwanda, Zambia, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Haiti</td>
<td>Angola, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Bangladesh</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014-2016</strong></td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Madagascar, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Haiti</td>
<td>Angola, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Bangladesh</td>
<td>Mozambique, Uganda, India (Odisha, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017-2019</strong></td>
<td>Papua New Guinea, Haiti</td>
<td>Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ghana, Madagascar, Nigeria, South Africa, Zambia, Indonesia</td>
<td>Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, India (Odisha, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh), Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020-2023</strong></td>
<td>(possible expansion into new countries depending on momentum and resources)</td>
<td>Benin, South Africa, Papua New Guinea, Haiti</td>
<td>Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, India (Odisha, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh), Bangladesh, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How CIP sees its role changing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale of impact at country level</strong></td>
<td>Up to 10,000 HHs reached</td>
<td>Up to 200,000 HHs reached</td>
<td>More than 200,000 HHs reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIP leadership role</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catalyzing</strong> Identify demand, demonstrate what’s possible, catalyze new alliances</td>
<td><strong>Coordinating</strong> Coordinate new programs; promote sweetpotato integration into national programs and investment plans</td>
<td><strong>Convening</strong> Transfer responsibility and enable leadership by national partners; link countries to regional and global networks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIP research role</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formative</strong>: proof-of-concept research; varietal selection; pilot seed systems and value chains</td>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong>: build strong evidence base; strengthen national research programs and link them to diversified value chains</td>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong>: assess scaling-up process; strategic research on key bottlenecks and new opportunities for expanding impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How CIP sees partners’ roles changing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIP roles</strong></td>
<td>Catalyzing leadership</td>
<td>Coordinating leadership</td>
<td>Convening leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative research</td>
<td>Supportive research</td>
<td>Strategic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner roles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Participation in technology development and proof-of-concept research</strong>; pilot interventions; organizing policy and stakeholder forums</td>
<td><strong>Lead dissemination and adaptation of technologies and delivery approaches</strong>; evidence building through operational research; training; advocacy</td>
<td><strong>Provide programmatic leadership</strong>; capacity strengthening; policy dialogue; strategic investments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RTB and CIP Strategy: what are the key points for SPHI?

1. Immediate focus on micronutrient impact of sweetpotato
   - OFSP as flagship
   - Develop a pipeline for other nutrients as well
   - Other benefits of sweetpotato (incomes, diversified use, systems productivity) covered through “linked products” or other flagships

2. Integrated, multidisciplinary approaches to scaling-up sweetpotato
   - Partners from agriculture, nutrition, private enterprise

3. Integration of project – program – institutional - CGIAR level objectives and indicators
   - Accountable to contribute to one Results Framework – partners need to be enabled
   - Opportunities for learning, accelerated progress
RTB and CIP Strategy: what are the key points for SPHI?

4. Evolution of roles of CGIAR and partners
   - Enable regional, national leadership
   - Effective partnerships with wider range of research and development partners
   - Strategic CGIAR-led research initiatives, linked to partner-led research and development initiatives - how do we create and manage these linkages?

5. Alignment of CGIAR and donor agendas around CRP’s
   - Global governance and accountability of CGIAR research through CRP’s
   - Emphasis on strengthening responsiveness to regional, country priorities (CAADP, FARA/SRO’s)
RTB and CIP Strategy: what are the key points for SPHI?

6. Demand for SPHI-like mechanism to
   - Support regional exchange of technologies (incl. germplasm), knowledge, and capacities
   - Broaden partnerships and linkages with
     - non-research partners in the region
     - global sweetpotato research community
     - related programs in RTB and other crops in the region
     - other agriculture-nutrition initiatives in the region
   - Facilitate collection and exchange of evidence across projects and agencies
   - Lead regional advocacy and communications
   - Enable regional leadership
Questions for discussion

• How should SPHI adjust to this changing context?

• What functions can and should SPHI take on?

• What institutional linkages are most effective for supporting regional leadership?