

Management response to “Evaluation Report” of CCAFS

1. Introduction

CCAFS thank those involved in the External Evaluation for the insights that CCAFS management and governance bodies have received in the course of the evaluation and in the final report. These are valuable in terms of charting the way forward into implementation of Phase II. CCAFS would like to acknowledge the many positive comments that have been made about the program. These also allow CCAFS to get an outsider perspective on what is working and needs to be maintained, and perhaps further strengthened. CCAFS management agreed with many of the points made in the external evaluation and found these a useful opportunity to think through solutions and positions going forward.

As requested regarding the overall utility of the report, we believe this could be improved in future evaluation cycles. Many of the recommendations contained elements that we were already aware of and incorporating in the Phase 2 thinking; hence the review provided limited “new” perspectives. The utility of the review could have been greatly improved if it had met the timetable for preparation and submission of the CCAFS proposal (in the end it missed both the pre-proposal and full proposal deadlines) and if it had provided greater evidence (particularly quantitative analyses that CCAFS could use in future proposals and reports) to support its recommendations. While independent review is necessary, we are not convinced that the return has been commensurate with the scale of the investment. We would suggest that future external evaluations of CRPs could follow a simpler, quicker, lower-cost model to provide greater value for money.

Below we indicate our responses and proposed actions for each of the recommendations. We have not provided a prioritisation among our proposed actions, as we intend to carry out all of these, so long as Phase 2 budget allows.

2. Management Response Matrix/Action Plan

CGIAR-level

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be taken (Each action should have a reference number)	Who Responsible for action	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
Recommendation 1: CCAFS has the potential to act as an integrating element drawing together research relevant to addressing climate effects on agriculture and food security in the future. On the basis of the Program's relevance, previous performance and potential, the Evaluation team recommends CCAFS to continue to Phase II.	We thank the reviewers for the positive overall assessment of CCAFS.	1. Cite this recommendation in response to ISPC and CO comments on the Phase II proposal.	1. CCAFS Program Director.	1. On resubmission of Phase II proposal (1 August 2016).	1. No
Recommendation 2. The management of the CCAFS for efficiency and effectiveness, its credibility with research partners, and the ways that CGIAR Centre researchers engage with the Program are all negatively affected by the unreliability of W1/W2	In the CCAFS risk catalogue, the top risk in all years has been the unreliability of funding and its implications for program management and strategic use of funds. CCAFS hopes this issue can be solved.	1. Pass on recommendation regarding more timely budgetary decisions and clear funding levels to Consortium	1. CCAFS Program Director.	1. In next relevant communication to CO.	1. No

funding. As a minimum, more timely budgetary decisions should be taken and funding levels should be set clearly by the Consortium Office at the beginning of the annual cycle and maintained for the full financial year.		Office, for their future use with funders and for internal planning processes.			
---	--	--	--	--	--

CCAFS-level

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be taken (Each action should have a reference number)	Who Responsible for action	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
<p>Recommendation 3. For improving the utility and realism of the Program’s impact pathways and accountability framework, CCAFS should adjust the sub-IDOs that the Program targets to make them operational for Program planning and management while responding to the CGIAR-level outcome expectations. Furthermore, CCAFS should develop revised targets and indicators that are commensurate with the global ambition, more specific in the context of each</p>	<p>CCAFS accepts this recommendation, and it has guided Phase II proposal development. This is a common issue across CGIAR and so is being done along with other CRPs. Cross-CGIAR work is in progress to align the IDOs and SLOs of the SRF with national development targets in 20 priority countries, under the CGIAR “site integration” process. For other priority countries not included in the CGIAR "site integration", CCAFS work close with national partners in addressing national priorities.</p>	<p>1. New sub-IDOs have been selected, as per the SRF. 2. All targets are in the process of being revised for the final Phase II proposal and are being made country-specific. 3. Participate in</p>	<p>1 and 2. CCAFS Flagship Program Leaders, Gender and Social Inclusion Leader. 3. CCAFS Regional Program Leaders.</p>	<p>1 and 2. Already completed, though being revised in the light of ISPC comments. 3. Country-specific targets agreed by December 2016, further alignment with national</p>	<p>1 and 2. No 3. Yes, the country engagement processes will need funding, though pooling of already allocated resources of multiple CRPs likely sufficient.</p>

<p>priority country, and more realistic for research on food security, gender equality and social inclusion, climate adaptation and mitigation, and policies and institutions.</p>		<p>“site integration” process for relevant countries.</p>		<p>policy processes and targets in 2017 through engagement with public sector, private sector and civil society partners.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 4. Taking into account its successes, its response to next-users’ and partners’ demands, and the potential for progress against system level objectives, and in face of a reduced funding envelope projected for Phase II, CCAFS should conduct a geographic prioritization of its activities refocusing on countries with lower CSA research capability. In rebalancing and focusing its regional portfolio, CCAFS should consider its comparative advantage relative to the strength of national partners, the prospects for influence and impact and the national demand for CCAFS’ institutional, policy and technological interventions. It should also consider how to build on and broaden the current strong national partnerships even if its leadership</p>	<p>CCAFS agrees with the evaluation team that a reprioritization of effort is needed. This has also been discussed by CCAFS management and by the CCAFS Independent Science Panel in 2015. This prioritization becomes even more important in view of CGIAR site integration plans and reduced budget.</p> <p>The inevitability of a higher proportion of bilateral funding in Phase II is likely to mean continued engagement in some countries that are not top tier priorities, but W1 and W2 funding would not be invested in these non-priority countries.</p> <p>In the Phase II proposal CCAFS has already made some adjustments (e.g. in South Asia, expect to expand work in Nepal and Bangladesh; in South East Asia</p>	<p>1. Re-prioritization of regions and countries in 2018, based on a scoring system by multiple stakeholders.</p>	<p>1. Leadership by CCAFS Program Management Committee, with wide participation by stakeholders.</p>	<p>1. 2018</p>	<p>1. Yes</p>

<p>and activities in those countries were to diminish.</p>	<p>have reduced work in Laos, Cambodia, Philippines and Indonesia; in Latin America will reduce work in Brazil and Peru to concentrate efforts in other countries; will increase our presence in LDCs of East Africa, including Rwanda, and reduce our efforts in Kenya) but have decided to maintain focus on the five countries in West Africa until a major re-prioritization exercise in 2018.</p> <p>For the first 3 years of Phase II, CCAFS believes the current set of regions and countries should be maintained (though with some change in effort levels as indicated above). Many CCAFS projects only started in 2015 and it would be wasteful of resources to prematurely abandon them (some of the lower performing projects have indeed already been cut). Then in 2018 CCAFS proposes a re-prioritization using a similar scoring method to that used in Phase I. In this process, entirely new regions can be considered. CCAFS believes that the prioritization exercise should be based on pre-agreed criteria (using qualitative and quantitative information) evaluated by multiple partners and</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	stakeholders. This re-prioritization process was discussed and agreed by the ISP in 2015.				
<p>Recommendation 5. Other than the largely supply-side and productivity driven approach in CSA, CCAFS has not addressed well issues of climate change effects on food insecurity, particularly on climate vulnerable people. To address this gap under a resourced constrained next phase CCAFS should partner with human nutrition and food security programs in Africa and South Asia that have greater capacity to explore food security issues from complementary perspectives to the CGIAR focus on supply side and food productivity.</p>	<p>CCAFS welcomes the recommendation that the way to address the non-production aspects of food security in a resource-constrained Phase II is through partnership. This is the strategy that CCAFS will follow during Phase II. CCAFS took the opportunity to update the Phase II proposal in response to the draft recommendation that was received in advance of the draft evaluation report.</p> <p>The new FP1 on “Priorities and policies for CSA” (this is a continuation of what is now FP4, ie the numbering has been changed), will partner with the CRPs A4NH and PIM on a new cluster of activity on “food and nutrition security futures under climate change”, focusing on scenario-guided formulation and implementation of policies and action plans relevant to food security under climate change. Partnering closely with A4NH and PIM, both led out of IFPRI, and a new partnership with WUR to enhance CCAFS’s access to first-</p>	<p>1. FP1 cluster of activity on “food and nutrition security futures under climate change”</p> <p>2. FP3 cluster of activity on “reducing food loss and waste”</p> <p>3. FP4 strengthened partnerships with food security early warning and response agencies</p>	<p>1. FP1 Leader 2. FP3 Leader 3. FP4 Leader</p>	1, 2, 3. Phase II	1. No

	<p>class nutrition modelling, will enable CCAFS science to enter impact pathways that involve LANSAs (an A4NH initiative) and other IFPRI-related food security projects.</p> <p>In the new FP3 on Low emissions development, a partnership with WUR and the PIM CRP will be established to undertake a new cluster of activity on “reducing food loss and waste” to deliver raised food security with mitigation co-benefits.</p> <p>In the new FP4 on Climate services and safety nets, there will be strengthened partnerships with food security early warning and response agencies at the global level (WFP, FAO, FEWSNET, ACF) and NGOs working on food security at the local level to deliver the safety net components of food security more effectively.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 6. In order to enhance its effectiveness, CCAFS would benefit from greater integration within the Program—among projects, FPs and RPs—and with other CRPs. To support better integration, CCAFS should improve coordination and researcher</p>	<p>The recommendation of greater integration is accepted. In relation to the two suggested mechanisms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Although improved reward structures would be desirable, CCAFS doubts that it would be feasible for CCAFS acting in isolation to change such mechanisms, as those are 	<p>1. The new online planning and reporting system will monitor and assess the extend and effectiveness of</p>	<p>1. CCAFS Head of Administration and ME&L Leader</p>	<p>1. Phase II</p>	<p>1. No</p>

<p>engagement by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. improving reward structures to incentivize researchers toward integration so researchers act as champions for transfer beyond their project requirements. ii. developing means for monitoring and assessing the extent and effectiveness of integration among projects. 	<p>determined at the Center level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Further developments of the CCAFS' online planning and reporting system, which is being done with the other Integrative CRPs, will include mechanisms for doing this. <p>In general, CCAFS has put quite some effort into getting more integration, including, for example, facilitating cross-Center writing groups (e.g. see recent success on global mitigation target in Global Change Biology), cross-Center projects, cross-Project meetings on specific themes, cross-Region activities (e.g. South-South learning; papers covering one or more regions and covering work from multiple flagships). But this does take resources and time, and for many activities CCAFS does need to let project teams implement their own projects. But even in this circumstance, CCAFS has a vision for cross-project products once projects are more advanced (e.g. joint F2/F4 work on climate services upscaling and the associated enabling policy environments required). The shift in 2015 towards empowerment of the regional programs and creation of regional</p>	<p>integration among projects</p>			
---	--	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

	portfolios of projects is a significant shift which should improve coordination between projects and flagships. Initial reports from 2015 are showing that this is paying off, hence implementation of this recommendation is already in progress.				
<p>Recommendation 7. In CCAFS' main impact pathways for FPs and projects have input-output relationships that are insufficiently explicit. In order to maximize the synergistic potential and coherence of its portfolio and to enhance the efficiency of overall results delivery, CCAFS should:</p> <p>i. optimize the sequencing of the activities in its FPs, and projects within FPs, by careful input-output mapping before projects in activity clusters commence. As part of this, the coherence between FP4 and the rest of the Program should be improved.</p> <p>ii. tailor the (generic) CSA and CSV frameworks in order to match local conditions in regions, and broaden partnerships to bring in additional skills currently not in the mix such as research organizations more engaged with the socio-economic aspects of</p>	<p>This recommendation is accepted in relation to strengthening impact pathways for the FPs. In response to the bullets:</p> <p>i. With regard to input-output mapping to optimize sequencing of activities, this may be a level of project control that in general may not be feasible, especially as CCAFS moves forward with two-thirds of its portfolio being funded bilaterally. This may well be feasible, however (and it is definitely desirable), for the limited resources available to the FPs for highly strategic activities.</p> <p>ii. Given the considerable differences between the target regions, this tailoring to local conditions is necessary and already happening- a key focus of regional programs. Some projects (including several involved in the FP4 RBM trial,</p>	<p>1. Utilize existing information in CCAFS online planning & reporting system to generate "maps" and timelines of major inputs and outputs in the current project portfolio.</p> <p>2. CCAFS core team to identify mismatches as well as unexploited synergies for prioritizing as opportunities arise in 2017-2018 to modify the project</p>	<p>1. FP1 leader, Knowledge and Data Sharing Coordinator</p> <p>2. Leadership by CCAFS Program Management Committee</p>	<p>1. December 2016</p> <p>2. Early in Phase II</p>	<p>1. No</p> <p>2. No</p>

<p>food security and human nutrition.</p> <p>iii. build on the policy engagement processes initiated with a view to focusing the regional programs to achieve greater coherence between FP4 and the rest of the Program. This could include clearer articulation of how projects in FP1, FP2 and FP3 are delivering key inputs into policy processes and upscaling, and reviewing relevance of some of the FP1 regional activities.</p> <p>iv. better define what “equitable institutional investments in climate smart food systems” are and how to assess moves towards them.</p>	<p>for example) are also adapting skill mixes within project teams to broaden partnerships. In general, CCAFS accepts that socio-economic expertise needs to be broadened.</p> <p>iii. accepted, particularly concerning FP1-FP4 and FP2-FP4 relationships.</p> <p>iv. This wording from the FP4 targets in the Extension Proposal has now been changed, though understanding of what “equitable” means in this context is an important question to address.</p>	<p>portfolio, on a region-by-region basis.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 8. CCAFS should broaden its framework for CSA from the current focus on agricultural technologies and implementation through CSVs, and build on the buy-in by the boundary partners taking into account:</p> <p>i. the rapidly changing socio-economic context of rural communities and subsequent house-hold level trade-offs that may involve moving out of agriculture as an adaptation</p>	<p>CCAFS rejects the notion that the CSA conceptual base is not broad enough to support this. CCAFS is regularly criticised for failing to bring a sharper focus to its working definition of CSA precisely because CCAFS believes that the framework should be broad to ensure that CSA is not treated in isolation of the hugely important and highly dynamic trends and drivers that rural communities face. CCAFS has a very wide interpretation of CSA, including for example migration as a valid response to climate change</p>				<p>Phase II</p>

<p>strategy.</p> <p>ii. the need to focus on more holistic livelihoods approach seeking greater social inclusion and addressing equity issues.</p> <p>iii. the extent to which other scales than village (for example watershed or landscape) are better for implementation in certain contexts.</p> <p>iv. research required to facilitate CSA out- and upscaling approaches using household typologies and placing greater emphasis on gender and social inequity.</p>	<p>(i.e. transformative adaptation). CCAFS does not believe the CSA concept limits CCAFS vision as to the trajectories that are feasible. The vision is very much grounded in the local realities through the CSVs, hence CCAFS has a broad base conceptual basis that adapts effectively to local realities. For example, the participatory process and relative effort on elements of CSA in West Africa are fundamentally different to the approaches in South Asia, nevertheless both regions operate in a CSA conceptual space. Hence CCAFS considers this recommendation to be totally aligned with the view of CSA. This is very much evident in the CCAFS Phase II proposal, where, amongst other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant effort is directed towards non-technology driven enablers of CSA, such as services, policies, and private sector development • transformational aspects of adaptation research are emphasized strongly • greater clarity is provided that CSVs are not geographically restricted to the “village” in the name – broader landscape and 				
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>catchment scales are implicit in their conception depending on the local realities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a cluster of activities has been developed on scaling-out through business models, micro-enterprise development and alignment of finance instruments to support CSA adoption • gender and social inclusion is addressed through analysis of the CCAFS gender household survey to understand socially differentiated adoption profiles of CSA practices and technologies; • trade-offs of food security, adaptation and mitigation of CSA technologies and practices will be identified in terms of how they differ for men and women, young and old as well as in relation to scaling up in CSVs. 				
<p>Recommendation 9. In order to enhance both the effectiveness and the relevance of CSA work CCAFS should generate evidence on climate smart solutions at the local level engaging in the following:</p>	<p>This recommendation makes total sense, and aligns closely with current CCAFS thinking and is welcomed. The Phase II proposal has been aligned closely to the suggested activities. Specifically, the new Flagship 2 (old Flagship 1) Theory of Change is focused on</p>	<p>1. Assess impacts on climate vulnerability in FP3 CoA2. 2. Joint FP2-3 Writing workshop in</p>	<p>1.FP3 leader and project leaders 2.FP3 leader and scientist</p>	<p>1. 2019 2. 2017</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes</p>

<p>i. conduct primary research on adaptive behavior by smallholder farmers in CSA adoption, locally grounded action-research to test the relevance of CSA technologies to different smallholder farmer types, and then promote proven technologies among target communities.</p> <p>ii. continue work on identifying better criteria to define what is climate smart and developing frameworks to underpin trade-off analysis.</p> <p>iii. publish in peer-reviewed journal critical reviews and lessons regarding CSVs in regard of their effectiveness to support climate smart solutions.</p> <p>iv. generate and publish evidence on effectiveness of CSA options, on impact of mitigation options on climate vulnerability, and on mitigation co-benefits from farming practices that aim at increasing climate resilience.</p>	<p>using CSVs for action research that is oriented towards generating scalable insights on CSA. Flagship 3's CoA 3.2 focuses on participatory evaluation and comparison of technology trials. We will ensure this includes impacts on climate vulnerability.</p> <p>Significant focus on the evidence base of CSA continues through the Compendium which synthesizes scientific knowledge on the benefits and trade-offs of a large range of CSA technologies and practices, including the mitigation co-benefits of resilience practices. As CSV work matures, CCAFS is focused more and more on research that synthesizes findings and extracts key lessons learnt to support scale out process. CCAFS agrees that more attention needs to be placed on trade-off analyses.</p>	2017 on mitigation-adaptation linkages			
<p>Recommendation 10. CCAFS has had a strong focus on climate risk management through its work on insurance and the development of agroclimate advisories. This should</p>	<p>The thoughtful recommendation is appreciated. It has been factored into the CCAFS Phase II proposal, (with the caveats below). Regarding part (i), the recommendation to conduct</p>	<p>1. Monitor and understand factors that would contribute to any apparent</p>	<p>1. FP2 Leader and project leaders 2. FP2 Leader and project</p>	<p>1. Phase II 2. Phase II. 3. Phase II</p>	<p>1. No 2. No 3. No</p>

<p>continue. To enhance the effectiveness of this work, CCAFS should strengthen FP2 activities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. conducting research on the determining factors that affect adaptive behaviour and the extent to which weather-indexed insurance provision leads to maladaptive behavior and increased risk taking; ii. improving targeting and design of CIS and insurance for reducing negative effects of climate change on the vulnerable, while increasing their food security; iii. combining climate and agricultural sciences in the design and provision of shock responsive and climate adaptive social safety nets; iv. conducting economic valuation of CIS provision to generate convincing evidence for national governments of the need to and returns from enhancing CIS. 	<p>research on factors that affect adaptive behavior is accepted. Given the recognition and evidence that insurance design issues, such as over-subsidizing premiums, can create perverse incentives for maladaptive behavior, the Program agrees to monitor and understand factors that would contribute to any apparent maladaptive behavior in its insurance implementation work. However, research on designing programs that avoid incentives for maladaptation is seen as a higher priority.</p> <p>Part (ii), on continuing to improve targeting and design of climate services and insurance for adaptation and food security, is accepted. The CCAFS Phase II proposal includes a strong emphasis on this.</p> <p>Regarding part (iii), the Program agrees that shock-responsive and climate-adaptive social safety nets is a promising and relevant area of research, and agrees to seek opportunities to expand in this area as funding and partnership opportunities allow. This is a relatively new area for the CGIAR, and past efforts by CCAFS to work on the issue did not gain traction;</p>	<p>maladaptive behavior in its insurance implementation work</p> <p>2. Improve targeting and design of climate services and insurance, including for women, through design of insurance implementation projects, and synthesis and methodological research on program design and effectiveness.</p> <p>3. Seek funding and partnership opportunities to expand research on shock responsive and climate adaptive social safety nets</p> <p>4. Hire a post-</p>	<p>leaders, with guidance from Gender and Social Inclusion Leader</p> <p>3. FP2 Leader, with relevant project leaders and Center researchers</p> <p>4. FP2 Leader with East Africa Regional Coordinator</p>	<p>4. 2016.</p>	<p>4. No, unless the valuation work continues beyond 2-year postdoc</p>
---	--	--	---	-----------------	---

	<p>CCAFS may have to resort to outside partnerships to make it happen.</p> <p>Part (iv), regarding economic valuation to generate evidence to inform investment in climate services, is accepted as a high priority. With bilateral funding, CCAFS is hiring a post-doctoral scientist through ILRI to start work on this issue, in partnership with the Africa Climate Policy Centre.</p>	<p>doctoral scientist on economic valuation of CIS</p>			
<p>Recommendation 11. CCAFS can increase its policy informing role – and thereby be more effective in achieving movement along the higher level theory of change by:</p> <p>i. engaging with target countries in the preparation of INDC reviews and NDC preparations focusing in on ways to reduce GHG emissions from the agricultural sector in ways that return co-benefits to adaptive capacity and food security.</p> <p>ii. Engaging with the most effective negotiating groups and their members in the UNFCCC that represent the interest of CCAFS priority countries</p>	<p>CCAFS has played a very active policy-informing role in Phase 1 and will continue to do so in Phase 2. While NDCs are a key focus, CCAFS will also continue to play an active role informing policies on climate risk management and CSA scaling-up at various scales.</p> <p>i. CCAFS has taken a major role in INDC development working with several countries on their INDCs and doing various well-received global analyses of the INDC portfolio. CCAFS will prioritize working with countries on NDCs. In Latin America, CCAFS supported Colombia through modelling work by IFPRI and local technical agro-climatic committees, Costa Rica by providing a future scenarios methodology and in Guatemala</p>	<p>1. CCAFS will continue close engagement with individual countries on their INDC development, including adaptation measures, mitigation measures, metrics and MRV, and financial information, and will continue to work closely with AGN, ASEAN and Latin American</p>	<p>1. Flagship Program Leaders, Regional Program Leaders and Head of Research.</p>	<p>1. 2016 and Phase II (ongoing).</p>	<p>1. Yes, for specific inputs to NDCs, UNFCCC reporting and policy positions as requested by parties/partners.</p>

	<p>and Honduras general inputs. CCAFS also established in 2015 a regional network of agricultural and forestry sector representatives to support implementation and achievement of the NDC targets. In South Asia, through CIMMYT and others CCAFS is analyzing adaptation co-benefits of mitigation in India to inform the NDC process. CCAFS SEA supported Vietnam to conduct the national consultation for the agriculture component of its INDC. Vietnam has requested CCAFS to again support the preparation of the detailed implementation plan of the agriculture component of the NDC. In East Africa, CCAFS supported development of CSA Framework Programs in five countries – Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Botswana and Namibia. A major outcome of this process was inclusion of CSA in the INDCs for Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.</p> <p>ii. Regarding UNFCCC negotiations, CCAFS has built very good relationships with AGN, ASEAN and in Latin America with several countries in looser coalitions (e.g. strong relationships with Uruguay and Colombia). Even when working with non-LDC countries, CCAFS</p>	<p>countries on UNFCCC policy.</p>			
--	---	------------------------------------	--	--	--

	often engages in South-South learning to bring lessons to LDCs and stimulate new approaches to CSA.				
<p>Recommendation 12. CCAFS activities in FP3 on low-emissions agriculture are rather isolated from other FPs and research elsewhere. CCAFS should improve integration of FP3 with the other Flagships and with research done by partners by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. using results from FP3 in FP1 and vice-versa for improving knowledge about reciprocal impacts of practices aiming at mitigation and increasing climate resilience; ii. improving partnerships at the sub-national level, particularly in terms of out- and upscaling of results from FP3; iii. increasing collaboration with other CRPs dealing with AFOLU, especially Forests, Trees and Agroforestry; iv. integrating to other research analysis of impacts of deploying bio-energy production systems on CSA, including analysis of the knock-on effects that this will have especially on food security. 	<p>The recommendation of integration is accepted. In response to the bullets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. FP3's Center projects on rice, livestock in EA, livestock in LAM and nitrogen fertilizer are complemented by FP1 or other CRP activities related to adaptation, so at the regional and country level, the impacts of practices on adaptation and mitigation are well integrated. CCAFS will aim for more systematic sharing of impacts at the FP level through annual science meetings and synthesizing practice impacts by region. ii. In the FP3 target countries CCAFS established subnational partnerships and intends to further strengthen these in Phase II. Existing partnerships are strongest in Kenya, where CCAFS works with the EADD, county governments and UNIQUE Forestry and Land Use. In Vietnam, CCAFS similarly works with subnational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FP3 will work closely with FP1 on systematic sharing of results on impacts at annual science meetings, and FP1 will make efforts to bring more FP3 results and approaches into the CSVs 2. FP3 will actively build partnerships at the sub-national level through closer participation with the CCAFS Regional Programs and the CGIAR site integration process 3. CoA 3.3.2 is in collaboration with FTA; will liaise with FTA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.FP3 leader 2.FP3 leader, project leaders and regional program leaders 3.FP3Leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.annually 2.2018 3.2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.no 2.no 3.yes

	<p>authorities and has established new partnerships with SNV and EDF. In Colombia, budget cuts reduced initially planned work with departments. Active engagements of Departments and relevant regional NGOs will now be undertaken.</p> <p>iii. FP3 has a modest project on agricultural drivers with FTA and has actively fundraised to increase this collaboration. Further collaboration would be useful in developing landscape approaches and MRV. FP3 is in regular contact with FTA scientists and managers at both CIFOR and ICRAF. FP3 is initiating collaboration with WLE in Phase II on France’s soil carbon initiative. Technology development of mitigation options is undertaken in the commodity CRPs, and very often a Center scientist working in CCAFS is in close contact with their colleagues in the commodity CRP.</p> <p>iv. Bioenergy is an important mitigation strategy, but given limited resources, we are focusing on mitigation</p>	<p>to identify additional points of collaboration</p>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

	opportunities where the CGIAR already has expertise and a comparative advantage. Many other actors are already conducting research on bioenergy. The CCAFS Independent Science Panel has recommended that CCAFS not expand into bioenergy.				
<p>Recommendation 13. In order to make progress towards Program objectives in general and the gender-related IDO in particular, CCAFS needs to strengthen both the systematic incorporation of gender inequity issues into its research design and the analysis of the effects of research results on gender relations and social inclusion in next-user and beneficiary populations. CCAFS should address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. gender equality and social inclusion concerns at the project design stage; ii. improving the integration of gender relations and social inclusion expertise in regional teams for enhancing gender relevance of regional activities; iii. identifying opportunities for generating benefits to women through low-emissions 	<p>CCAFS recognized the need to strengthen its gender work, and to this end restructured in late 2014 and appointed a new thematic leader on Gender and Social Inclusion in April 2015. Additionally, in 2013-2014 CCAFS provided support to regional teams on gender expertise through regional workshops on gender mainstreaming in participatory action research. In WA this resulted in the development and implementation of 3 specific research proposals on gender.</p> <p>CCAFS is in the process of developing a gender and CSA design, implementation and impact assessment conceptual framework which will lead to gender impact assessment methodologies for each flagship.</p> <p>Regarding i) All projects in the</p>	<p>1. Produce gender and CSA design, implementation and impact assessment conceptual framework with associated gender impact assessment methodologies for each Flagship Program.</p> <p>2. Technical advice and inputs; making available resource materials, toolkits and guidelines; and</p>	<p>1.GSI Leader 2. GSI Leader, Regional Program Leaders 3.Flagship Leader, GSI Leader 4.Flagship Leaders, GSI Leader 5. GSI Leader and regional program leaders</p>	<p>1. 2016-2017 2. 2016 and ongoing in Phase II 3. 2017 4. 2017 5. 2016 and Phase II</p>	<p>1. No 2. No 3. No 4. No 5. Yes</p>

<p>agriculture;</p> <p>iv. identifying areas (components of FPs and projects under RPs) where good GIS research can be conducted and focus the GIS resources on these areas to learn lessons that can then be applied across the Program and by others.</p> <p>v. gender relations and social inclusion aspects of CSA adoption through inter- and intra-household level research, including generation of gender differentiated data through baselines and monitoring;</p>	<p>current portfolio (which started in 2015) had to consider gender issues at the design phase; for example, in Latin America, this resulted in the study of women’s role in Colombian livestock sector highlighting its relevance in the production system, as well as analysis on gender integration in climate change and agriculture policies in the region.</p> <p>While gender research capacities have definitely improved, there is a limit to the extent CCAFS can enhance capacities throughout the CGIAR (also on impact pathway thinking etc.). CCAFS nonetheless agrees that the recommendation is important and will aim to improve performance in each design cycle.</p> <p>Regarding iii) CCAFS will provide support to regional teams to enhance expertise in gender and social inclusion through technical inputs to project design and impact assessment (ex ante and pro ante); provision of resource materials, toolkits and guidelines; and support to the Gender CC network.</p> <p>Regarding iv) CCAFS will undertake an assessment in 2017 of research results to date on gender trends</p>	<p>support to the GenderCC network.</p> <p>3. An assessment in 2017 of research results to date on gender trends and benefits of LED practices</p> <p>4. Gender research to date will be synthesized in each of the Flagship Programs, paired with a planning process on moving forward based on results and lessons learned</p> <p>5. Develop a project on gender and decision making</p>			
---	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>and benefits of LED practices, including women's role in value chains, with a view towards developing a set of lessons learned for generating increased benefits to women.</p> <p>Regarding v) This recommendation will be addressed through the ongoing process of synthesizing gender research to date in each of the Flagship Programs, paired with a planning process on moving forward based on results and lessons learned. This activity will also enhance the integration of GSI in regional activities (ii).</p> <p>CCAFS is developing a project in relation to (vi) to address household decision making aspects related to gender and CSA, with an initial pilot study is currently underway in Malawi. In addition, the CSV approach in Latin America already involves the analysis of CSA practices adoption including a gender perspective.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 14. CCAFS should improve its processes for outcome tracking and impact assessment, in order to learn how outcomes and impact happen, to enable better adaptive management, and to</p>	<p>CCAFS accepts this recommendation, although what is recommended here is very broad and generic, and surely applies to all R4D activity. In response to the bullets:</p> <p>i. This has been occurring over</p>	<p>1. Flagship hypotheses will be tested.</p> <p>2. Baselines will be incorporated in FP3 projects</p>	<p>1. Flagship Program Leaders, GSI Leader</p> <p>2. FP3 Leader</p>	<p>1. Phase II</p> <p>2. 2016 onwards</p> <p>3. 2016 for CSA and Phase II more generally</p>	<p>1. No</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p>

<p>provide greater accountability. The Program should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. strengthen the ToC related to impact pathways at regional and FP levels by better definition of assumptions and risks and transforming these into hypotheses for testing during Program implementation – this is good theory of change practice outside of the CGIAR; ii. test these hypotheses with the most robust experimental approaches applicable in different contexts, seeking additional resources for this when necessary iii. use participatory impact pathway analysis method to generate ‘stretch objectives’ at project and RP levels and to provide incentives for learning from failures and successes at project, RP and FP levels; iv. develop long-term monitoring practices for effectiveness of low-emissions agriculture innovations; v. continue and expand on the efforts on economic valuation of benefits deriving from CSA and CIS; 	<p>the last six months as the Phase II proposal has been developed. Several Flagship assumptions are now hypotheses to be tested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Accepted, although there may be practical constraints to doing this in situations where a wide range of research activities are co-located with many partners. iii. Regional workshops in 2014 (including gender impact pathway workshops) went some way to doing this, although projects finishing up and new ones starting afford opportunities to apply these kinds of methods. Incentivizing learning from failure is an issue that needs to be addressed at CGIAR level, although the mechanics for this are being incorporated in CCAFS’ online planning and reporting system. iv. These are being developed and baselines will be incorporated in FP3 projects in the online planning and reporting system from 2016 onwards. v. Accepted. vi. The wording here is from FP4 targets that have been modified heavily for the Phase II 	<p>in the online planning and reporting system from 2016 onwards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. CCAFS will expand work on the economic valuation of benefits deriving from CSA and CIS, including in 2016. 4. CCAFS will develop a set of online resources to accompany its ME&L strategy. 5. An expanded, cross-CRP online planning & reporting system is being developed (MARLO) and stakeholders trained in its use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Flagship Program Leaders, assisted by Head of Research in 2016 4. ME&L Leader 5. FP1 Leader, Knowledge and Data Sharing Coordinator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Phase II 5. End of 2016 and Phase II 	
--	---	---	--	--	--

<p>vi. examine how well national and subnational food system policies take into consideration climate smart practices and strategies, and assess if and to what extent (sub-) national jurisdictions increase their institutional investments in food systems in ways that address climate change effects;</p> <p>vii. expand training of CGIAR researchers and CCAFS' partners in ToC and impact pathways.</p> <p>viii. and, as part of the FAIR information management system roll-out CCAFS should provide the software and capacity enhancement on its use to all CGIAR Centers and facilitate adoption in other CRPs.</p>	<p>proposal. However, these are research questions that will be addressed from 2017 onwards.</p> <p>vii. CCAFS will continue with the development of a set of online resources to accompany its ME&L strategy, and some webinars will be held once this "support pack" is reasonably complete. It should be noted that training of CGIAR researchers in ToC is the joint responsibility of all CRPs and Centres, not just CCAFS.</p> <p>viii. The CCAFS planning and reporting system is being re-developed as MARLO (Managing Agricultural Research for Learning and Outcomes) in collaboration with PIM, A4NH, WLE, and possible MAIZE, WHEAT, LIVESTOCK and other CRPs too, who are also contributing towards the cost of redevelopment and maintenance.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--