

CO Comments to CRPs regarding 2015-2016 CRP Extension Proposals**CRP Name: Livestock & Fish (L&F)****A. Overall assessment of the Extension Proposal**

This is a very good Extension Proposal, conceptually coherent and clear. Regarding its structure, L&F is switching from 6 old Themes to 5 Flagship Projects (FPs), with each of them broken down into 2 to 4 Clusters of Activities (CoAs). This provides a well-balanced program between different scientific domains (animal health, vaccine research, development and production, animal and plant genetics & breeding) and multidisciplinary activities focused on biological, socio-economic disciplines for VC and gender activities as well as socio-environmental-economic modelling in SASI. Four of the new FPs are related to discovery and the fifth one aims to deliver innovation enabling sustainable scale-up.

In terms of innovative thinking and scientific quality, L&F plans to include genomics, bioinformatics and modern breeding approaches (e.g. Genomic Selection) in the livestock breeding process. Other innovations are: developing a new vaccine against CCPP (contagious caprine pleuropneumonia) or delivery of animal health products through private sector (FP1), selection of heat-tolerant ruminants or new calcium-rich Mola fish (FP2), novel feed resources including algae or insects (FP3), and setting up an interdisciplinary team mixing social scientists and economists to target VC tools (FP5).

In the Extension Proposal, L&F's research and development partnerships activities are presented separately. For research, top-level collaborations are highlighted, e.g. with WUR, SLU, GALVmed (vaccine production in UK), Roslin Institute (UK), Royal Veterinary College (UK), USDA, Washington State University and CSIRO. For development, the key partners are the Netherland Development Organization (SNV), CARE international among others (see p.10). LF collaborates with other CRPs: (i) HT, GRiSP, MAIZE, DC on feed/forage breeding; (ii) RTB & HT on the underuse of cassava peels for animal & fish feed; (iii) A4NH to address food safety and zoonosis issues across several VCs; and (iv) PIM around the development and use of VC tools for assessment and foresight.

The budget is well-allocated by FPs and CoAs (Annex3) for L&F and then separately for the four Centers collaborating in this program: ILRI, CIAT, ICARDA and Worldfish, which is highly appreciated.

Finally, the Consortium Science Team would like to emphasize that the quality of this proposal is fully aligned with the excellence of the last documents provided by L&F: the 2013 Annual Report and the 2014 POWB.

L&F's extension proposal was considered as highly satisfactory and ranked in the top 5 of the 15 CRP submissions. The extension proposal does not need to be amended prior to submission to the Consortium Board for approval. However, we do require you to respond to the specific comments given below, together with the ISPC report (attached). In addition you are required to complete a performance matrix as per the attached template. We require these by August 25, 2014.

B. Specific points that Livestock & Fish needs to address

1) Intermediate development Outcomes (IDOs), Theories of Change (ToC) and Impact Pathways (IP)

- a) L&F addresses six IDOs, with clear mapping to the 4 CGIAR SLOs. Generic IDO indicators are described in Table 1. Unfortunately, the indicators are generic and clear metrics & timelines (targets) for project monitoring are missing.
- b) In L&F's generic ToC, described in Figure 1 (Annex 1, p.17), there is a lack of connection between the 5 proposed FPs (absent in this figure), the different activities described, and the expected IDOs. Only two sub-ToCs (the IPG ToC and VC ToC) are mentioned, and no justification is given on why the others are omitted. If there is a need to break down the generic L&F ToC into sub-ToCs, as done by other CRPs and recommended by ISPC in its 2012 Report, it should be consistently done for all 5 FPs. In addition, the 5 FPs should be mapped with both the generic ToC pathway as well as connected to the targeted IDOs.

2) Flagship projects

- a) The proposal fails to bring out the synergy between (1) Livestock AND Fish, for instance in genomics, bioinformatics or genomic selection; and (2) between L&F AND Fodder
- b) The value chain approach is currently included in all the commodity programs and is even a full FP in PIM. Complementarities have to be identified between CRPs and synergic activities implemented to increase shared knowledge on that topic and secure impact (e.g. through a Community of Practice?)

3) Gender

- a) Figures in the budget Table show the gender budget declining from US\$2.4 in 2015 to US\$1.4 m in 2016. Please provide an explanation for this change, or correct the figures in the Table if this is an error.
- b) The section on "Gender in the Workplace" which was requested for the proposal has been omitted. Please include it.
- c) For indicators on IDO 3 (p. 5), the program uses flawed concept of sex disaggregation based on household structure (comparison of households headed by men versus female-headed households). This is not considered gender analysis since it does not allow a valid comparison between males and females in the population. For further advice please consult the CRP's Network gender experts or PIM's paper providing Guidelines on Sex Disaggregated Data Collection.

4) Partnerships

- a) Concerning partnership with the private sector, which are the general terms of the agreements? Are the conditions dependent on the size (turnover) of the company? Which

are the general Intellectual Property arrangements in these collaborations, and are they aligned with the CGIAR Intellectual Assets policy?

- b) For the inter-CRP collaborations, the role of each collaborating CRP, in the future platform as well as in other partnerships, has to be very well-defined and linked to the L&F FPs and CoAs indicating the corresponding budget.

5) Phased work-plan

- a) The phased work-plan is too brief in the text and too detailed in Annex 2, which needs to be addressed accordingly.
- b) The innovative topics described in the narrative should be clearly identified and mapped in the table in Annex 2 (e.g. using different colours), including their corresponding additional budget.

6) Budget

In the FinPlan 2014-15, the L&F total budget for 2015 is US\$29,3m with 16,5m provided through W1/2 and 5,5m through W1, the lowest W1/W1+2 ratio over all the CRPs (33%). For 2016, L&F requests a 10% budget increment - in alignment with all the other CRPs-, which is strongly supported by the excellent quality of the proposal.

- a) Nevertheless, priorities have to be more clearly identified and precisely mapped to the 10% additional budget request at the CoA level, for example in the table in Annex 3 p. 37-38.