

ADDENDA

Contents

5.1 PIM Response to ISPC Comments of June 15, 2016 on the Full Proposal for Phase 2	2
5.2 FEWG Criteria of Evaluation and Where to Look for the Corresponding Material in the Proposal	23

5.1 PIM Response to ISPC Comments of June 15, 2016 on the Full Proposal for Phase 2

- Comments at program level

Comment	Response
Develop and initiate a plan to engage in a critical analysis of PIM's comparative advantage that enhances the proposal's strategic focus and its particular contribution to the delivery of the SRF. The list of six comparative advantages on p. 28 is simply a list, not an analysis of those factors in each domain the CRP contemplates working.	We agree with the importance of continuous reflection on PIM's comparative advantage. This will allow PIM to fulfill its integrative function within CGIAR and to contribute to the efforts of the development community more generally. These discussions have occurred through consultations in the course of developing the proposal, and additionally during and after the Montpellier meeting of CRP Directors in June 2016. We will continue the reflection on comparative advantage in formulating the detailed work program for 2017. We have sharpened the general definition of comparative advantage (see Section 1.0.8): "The definition of comparative advantage used in design of the PIM program has three components: (a) researchers are recognized as technical experts in the field in question, and able to deliver excellence in applied research; (b) the work proposed is relevant to the SLOs and PIM can make a significant contribution to the CGIAR portfolio-wide effort; (c) PIM brings a unique perspective that enables it to contribute research results distinct from those of other providers. Component (a) is assessed according to metrics of quality of science. Component (b) reflects interactions between and among CRPs to contribute to outcomes in shared subject areas, such as value chains or gender, and in a given geography, such as PIM's contribution to assessing the enabling environment for agricultural growth in the CGIAR countries of collaboration. PIM's unique attributes referenced in component (c) often relate to the ability to link the developmental topic to agricultural issues and to link social science research with agronomy and biology. Uniqueness may also derive from a long-standing in-country presence and reputation for objectivity, quality, and responsiveness to demand." Table 1.0.8.1 illustrates how each flagship addresses the three components of comparative advantage. In each flagship narrative, we now specify the constraints to attainment of the SLOs addressed and show the relevance (item b above) of the work in this regard. The revision draws on comments from the ISPC, prior consultation with researchers and partners, discussions with CRP Leaders in Montpellier in June 2016 and earlier, and follow-up meetings organized by PIM in July 2016 to agree on the respective roles of PIM and other CRPs on foresight, impact assessment of technology adoption, and value chains. The outcomes of these meetings have been incorporated into Annex 3.7, Tables 1 and 2a. We will continue regular interaction with other CRPs at the Director level to supplement the technical interactions within the communities of practice and to assure that PIM is addressing policy and institutional priorities of the other CRPs. We will also consider with the PIM Independent Steering Committee and the program's strategic partners whether external providers may be in a better position to pursue selected research. If so, partnerships will be used to leverage PIM's capacities.

Comment	Response
Strengthen the overall coherence of the CRP through identification and strengthening of the functional linkages among the FPs In its pre-proposal commentary, ISPC requested that PIM present a more coherent rationale for the FP structure and the value of linkages among CoAs. The PIM narrative now sketches out – though not entirely convincingly – linkages between flagships in a paragraph on p. 25 and visually through a conceptual framework diagram (Fig 1.6.2), which still falls short of adequately illustrating the inter-dependencies across the six FPs. In Fig 1.3.1, showing the relationships between FP-level outputs, outcomes and program-level outcomes, there are no obvious inter-FP linkages. It is still not entirely clear, for example, how foresight researchers will work with value chain partners or how the outputs of each would be used by the others.	As an integrative CRP, PIM has two axes of coherence; one with other CRPs across the CGIAR portfolio, and another between and among flagships within PIM. While PIM's flagships link to each other in specific ways, linkages with AFS CRPs (and external partners) are at least as important as linkages within the CRP. PIM flagships on technology, value chains, natural resource governance and gender have been formulated because of the importance of policy and social science research in these themes across the CRPs, rather than because they are interlinked within PIM. For example, the gender work in Flagship 6 achieves some impact through linkages within PIM, but more through links with other CRPs and external partners. The flagships on agricultural transformation and social protection provide complementary research to other CRPs. We have strengthened the discussion of the linkages between and among PIM flagships in both the CRP and flagship narratives. Examples of linkages between flagships of PIM are noted below: • The modeling tools developed under Flagship 1 have provided an insightful assessment of the costs and benefits of reduction in postharvest losses studied in Cluster 3.2. • Research on seed systems (Cluster 1.2) complements work on strengthening input markets (Cluster 3.2). • Analysis of farm size dynamics (Cluster 2.1) informs work on arrangements for extension and advisory services (Cluster 1.2), and changes in tenure and land administration (Cluster 5.1). • Research on agricultural expenditure (Cluster 2.2) informs work on investment in agricultural research (Cluster 1.2), spending on advisory services and extension (Cluster 1.2), and spending on social protection programs (Cluster 4.1). • Political economy research (Cluster 2.3) provides guidance to all flagships, in particular on topics of investment in agricultural research (Cluster 1.2), and property rights (Cluster 5.1). • Analysis of land tenure issues (Cluster 5.1) is important for understanding policy constraints to technology adoption (Cluster 1.2), for research on structural change and farm size dynamics (Flagship 2), for understanding how social protection affects adoption of agricultural technologies (Cluster 4.1), and for research on institutional arrangements for management of shared landscapes in Cluster 5.2. • Gender tools and methods (Cluster 6.1) inform work throughout the flagships. Interventions to facilitate adoption of improved technologies by women are examined jointly by Clusters 6.1 and 1.2. Clusters 6.1 and 3.2 work together on participation of women in value chains. Work on gender and land rights is done collaboratively with Clusters 2.1 and 5.1. . The previous Figure 1.0.3.1 has been removed. The new Figure 1.0.3.2 shows joint contributions of PIM's flagships and other CRPs to the specific SLO related to adoption of technology. The figure illustrates the joint contributions of many elements of the system in achieving an SLO target. This can also be seen in the new Figure 1.0.7.1, which shows the interrelatedness of different dimensions of the program and portfolio in one location.

Comment	Response
Define a strategy for more effectively integrating social science and policy research across the CRPs to maximize synergies, elaborating how PIM will engage with and leverage the efforts of other CRPs to achieve System-level objectives	PIM's strategy to enhance the integration of social science research across the CRPs has five components: (a) continued discussions with CRP Directors and Science Leaders to identify social science research within their programs and points of potential collaboration with PIM; (b) continuation and expansion of the communities of practice for foresight modeling, adoption and ex post impact assessment of technology, value chain research, and natural resource management; (c) collaboration in social science research and support for policy analysis in selected CGIAR countries of collaboration, for example through Country Strategy Support Programs; (d) leadership of the CGIAR collaborative platform for gender research; and (e) convening of an annual conference of CGIAR social scientists. With regard to (a), discussions with other CRPs and Centers about synergies with PIM during Phase 2 started early in 2016, continued at the Montpellier Science Leaders meeting in June 2016, and expanded during follow-up meetings organized by PIM in July 2016 to agree on the respective roles of PIM and other CRPs on foresight, impact assessment of technology adoption, and value chains. The outcomes of these meetings have been incorporated into Annex 3.7, Tables 1 and 2a. In 2016 a PIM-A4NH-WLE-CCAFS joint study will be conducted in Ethiopia and Bangladesh to identify potentially overlapping policy agendas within the domains of these CRPS and to coordinate efforts. This collaborative work will be expanded to other priority countries in Phase 2. Integration of social science and policy research across the CRPs takes place at the portfolio level, as different programs jointly contribute to outcomes. See Annex 3.11.7 "PIM's Contribution to SLO Targets: Methodology Note" for a description of different elements contributing to specific SLOs. The new Figure 1.0.3.2 shows how PIM integrates its research with other CRPs to contribute to the technology adoption SLO targets. The new Figure 1.0.3.3 shows joint efforts of PIM and other CRPs in analysis of postharvest loss and food waste. These joint efforts toward common objectives serve to build common methods and shared results, thus drawing social science researchers across the system together. The new Figure 1.0.7.1 "PIM's contributions to engagement of CGIAR with Ethiopian partners" shows connections between and among flagships in PIM and links with other CRPs on shared agendas of social science research. Details of social science interactions with other CRPs can be found in the flagship narratives. Following further dialogues with CRPs in July 2016, all flagship narratives have been updated except for Flagship 6 (Cross-cutting Gender Research and Coordination). Coordination on gender work will be furthered during the meeting of the CGIAR Gender Network in October 2016 to complete design of the collaborative platform and agree with the Gender Network on strategic priorities for research across the system.

Comment	Response
Focusing research on activities that exploit complementarities with other CRP activities rather than addressing very broad topics.	Complementarity can mean either fulfilling a specific function in joint work with other CRPs, or providing a unique contribution needed for achievement of the SLOs, that other CRPs cannot provide. PIM's portfolio includes both types of complementarity. Complementarity in the sense of working together can be seen particularly where communities of practice are active, such as foresight modeling, adoption of technology, value chains, natural resource management, and gender research. Within the domains of these communities of practice, we have consulted with members of the communities of practice who also work in other CRPs and with Science Leaders to identify areas of complementarity as shown in the revised Table 1 of Annex 3.7 (Overview of inter-CRP collaboration). Complementarity in the form of providing a unique and essential contribution can be seen in the work on rural transformation, economywide effects, trade, and social protection.
Indeed, PIM has made the case that it will not focus on topics covered by other CRPs, e.g., "PIM has elected not to invest heavily in irrigation policy (covered by WLE), food safety policy (covered by A4NH), and land degradation (covered by FTA and WLE)." These issues offer entry points for PIM for collaboration and cross-system research synergies, but they are left to the other CRPs.	PIM works at a higher level of aggregation on many topics that are also addressed by other CRPs, e.g. foresight, seed systems, value chains, and gender. PIM has consulted with other CRPs to identify complementarity and selectivity of focus in the topics covered. Each of the topics noted in the comment from the ISPC is addressed by the CRP identified. PIM does some work on water as part of the work on tenure of natural resources and institutional arrangements for managing across landscapes, but most work on water is undertaken by WLE, which we think is an appropriate division of labor.
The fact that identical wording is often used in Table 1 Overview of Inter-CRP Collaboration (Annex Section 3.7) across all AFS CRP cells, raises concerns as to whether genuine linkages and interactions are forming.	We note the concern, and have provided more detailed information on coordinated plans with each CRP in the revised Annex 3.7 Tables 1 and 2a.

Comment	Response
Finally, the ISPC notes with some concern the 'low priority' given to "Develop CRPs and Centers' partnering capacities" within the context of the CapDev framework (p. 31).	Building the research capacity of Centers and CRPs is central to PIM's work, and realized through collaborative studies, management of communities of practice, development of methods and tools, and data sharing. According to the CapDev framework, the indicator "Develop CRPs and Centers' partnering capacities" reflects specifically the capacity of CGIAR bodies to partner (and not the general capacity of CGIAR bodies). PIM does not directly address the "capacity to partner". We have assigned "high" and "medium" priority to the CapDev framework elements that we directly target.
However overall, the work is not well integrated with the AFS CRPs and will be conducted mostly by IFPRI.	Discussion of integration with the AFS CRPs has been enhanced in each of the flagship sections and in Annex 3.7. PIM is an integrative CRP with participation of all CGIAR Centers, as shown clearly in the budget tables. In the indicative budget, approximately 65% of Window 1-2 research funds are allocated to the Lead Center, and 35% to Participating Centers and managing partners. After allocation to CGIAR Centers and managing partners, about 25% of funds flow through to research partners and participants in capacity development. The earlier presentation of the budget data aggregated allocations to a number of CGIAR Centers under the category "CGIAR collaboration." This was consistent with the guidance on budgets, but the budget tool did not pick up the category "CGIAR collaboration," and assigned an inaccurately high proportion of funds to the Lead Center. We have remedied this mistake in the current presentation of the budget data.
Provide further articulation of the TOC at the program and FP levels specifying the assumptions and IPs that recognize the complexities of achieving policy and institutional change RP and FP level TOCs do not delve sufficiently into the complexity of the process, surprising given the subject area of the proposal. The TOCs need to show how CoAs (for FPs) and FPs (for PIM at large) complement each other to help achieve FP level and overall PIM program outcomes in a coherent fashion.	The sections on ToC at the program and flagship level have been revised. The presentation of the flagships' theories of change in the flagship narratives has been aligned with the general program's ToC, and assumptions are now more explicitly covered in each flagship. Please see the new Figure 1.0.3.1 representing PIM's overall theory of change. See also the new Figure 1.0.3.2 showing PIM's role as an integrating CRP working in conjunction with other programs facilitating achievement of impact (for the example of technology adoption). Finally, see the new Figure 1.0.3.3 showing how PIM uses its four channels of influence in an integrated approach to contribute to reduction of postharvest loss and food waste (sub-IDO of SRF and SDG Target 12.3).

Comment	Response
PIM maintains that its policy-level impact will come from influencing global agendas and policies, sharing tools and datasets, testing innovations for ‘boundary partner’ adoption, and raising the bar on research quality via capacity building and communities of practice. Each of these represents a relatively remote, theoretical and highly optimistic pathway that seems to miss the ‘final mile’ steps that are needed to translate knowledge into practice in measurable ways. The proposal needs to define in precise and concrete ways how attributable policy influence will be achieved.	PIM’s theory of change is presented more clearly and with more disaggregation by steps in the new Figure 1.0.3.1. Influence on next users is pursued through identification of a mechanism for change and key actors in the process, followed by selection of partners to enhance engagement and likelihood that the research will have influence. Much of the research is conducted jointly with boundary partners, and/or with frequent interaction with next users (including during the agenda-setting process, to ensure that research addresses their needs). Several examples of partnerships with national policy makers and international organizations are noted in the CRP-level and flagship narratives. PIM’s list of key countries of engagement considers potential for policy impact, which is influenced by the presence of an IFPRI Country Strategy Support Program (e.g. in the cases of Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, and Nigeria). CSSPs provide a vehicle to influence policy and support strategy development through research, capacity building, and policy dialogue. PIM also benefits from long-standing relationships of Participating Centers and partners with national counterparts. For example, PIM’s work in Tanzania draws on the institutional presence of IITA and Michigan State University. PIM relies on a framework of documenting relevance and contribution to policy processes without claiming attribution. This approach was endorsed at a workshop convened by PIM and SPIA in Phase 1.
Fig. 1.3.1 does not show any program-level outcomes achieved by synergistic combinations of different FP-level outcomes or linkages with other CRPs in achieving SRF outcomes. It is surprising that there is little discussion of PIM’s work having impact through interaction with other CRPs.	In response to this feedback, we have removed the previous Figure 1.0.3.1. The revised Figure 1.0.2.1 shows the joint contribution of PIM and other CRPs’ research to the SLO targets. The new Figure 1.0.3.2 shows how PIM works together with other CRPs toward one SLO target – adoption of technology.

Comment	Response
Exactly how PIM will work with other CRPs in the integration countries has not been specified aside from statements such as “PIM will participate in the integration site plans once they are finalized”, though many other CRPs are actively engaged in developing those plans. The exception is for Ethiopia and Ghana where PIM states their preference for “engaging in bilateral discussions with key government and development stakeholders to identify priority policy areas for PIMrather than establishing a separate mechanism.”	PIM fully supports country collaboration, and has participated in all meetings to develop plans in site integration ++ countries. PIM has significant presence in each of these countries, with the exception of Nicaragua, and partial exception of Vietnam. PIM’s primary contributions to country collaboration are: (a) diagnostic assessment of the strength of the enabling environment to support the work of CGIAR; (b) identification of key constraints to success of the CGIAR portfolio in that country; (c) specific interventions to remedy policy and institutional constraints; and (d) facilitating coordinated engagement with national counterparts on policy issues. In the revised proposal (Section 1.0.7 and Annex 3.7), PIM provides clearer language confirming this commitment, and an example showing how it is implemented in Ethiopia (Figure 1.0.7.1). The language noted by the reviewer in quotations led to misunderstanding, and has been removed.
Due consideration should be given to expanding the geographic domain of activity to include more Francophone countries in Africa.	PIM works in the following francophone countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (see Annex 3.11.5 "Countries of engagement").
Some examples of how an understanding of gender has helped shape the agendas under each FP would strengthen the proposal.	Such examples can be found in Annex 3.4.

Comment	Response
PIM's capacity development work is focused on promoting adoption of PIM concepts, tools and findings, rather than on raising the level and quality of agriculture and policy research more broadly. The proposal would be strengthened by a clear overarching strategy for building lasting capacity to take on similar work in-country or global post-PIM, as opposed to simply training individuals.	PIM develops tools and methods to raise the level and quality of agricultural and policy research. The Social Accounting Matrices (SAMs) are among the most downloaded items produced by CGIAR. The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEIA) is growing in application, as more development agencies use it to track the impact of their programs on women's empowerment. The work on unifying methodological approaches for measuring distortions in agricultural trade and value chains benefits (among others) the FAO MAFAP program, which regularly acknowledges the contribution. The tools for value chain analysis accessible through the www.tools4valuechains.org website are used by an array of partners within and outside CGIAR. The Country Strategy Support Programs provide ongoing capacity development for national partners. The PIM capacity development strategy has relied more on development of tools and institutional strengthening than on training of individuals, which appears to be consistent with the recommendation of the reviewers. The language in Section 1.0.3 and Annex 3.3 has been strengthened to convey the approach to capacity development described above.
The outcomes are described in fairly general terms and not clear how budgets have been framed in relation to the intended work. The proposal would be strengthened by inclusion of more detail, particularly for the value-chain activity.	Budgets have been framed in reference to historic costs applied to the work programs described. The budget narratives for each flagship (Sections 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 2.5.2, 2.6.2) include brief descriptions of the levels and categories of costs. Budgets for all flagships are at this point indicative, and will be developed in greater detail during annual planning exercises when levels of actual funding are clearer.
Of interest is the assumption made that each FP leader will only spend 30% FTE on FP coordination. Even with a 100% FTE program manager, that seems too low.	We wish to attract Flagship Leaders who are recognized experts in their fields. Few such people would accept positions that are largely administrative, and that leave little time for research and policy engagement. Seeking to fund a proportion of the time of Flagship Leaders in excess of 30% for management, administration, and reporting (as opposed to research) would inflate the program's management costs and reduce the pool of interested candidates. We will leverage the time of Flagship Leaders by hiring program managers.

Comment	Response
US\$730,000 allocated to M&E activities as “collaborator fees” and travel costs for external evaluations raises questions. Since there are few actual interventions being proposed (which would require at least baseline and endline primary data collection), this estimate appears rather high.	As explained in Annex 3.6 and in the CRP budget narrative (Sections 1.1.4 and 1.1.6), the \$730,000 includes impact assessment, external evaluations, documenting research outcomes, setting up an online planning and reporting tool jointly with the other integrating CRPs, training sessions, and participation in the MEL CoP. The list of evaluations proposed can be found in Annex 3.6.
There is a Management Committee, more than half of whom are IFPRI staff. This raises an issue about the insufficient level of integration with other CRPs. Hence, despite the ‘linkages’ that exist with non-IFPRI CGIAR entities, PIM is dominated by the interests and priorities of IFPRI. IFPRI researchers are the leaders in every FP and almost all CoAs within them.	In Phase 1 the Management Committee included five flagship leaders (all from IFPRI), two Focal Points selected by the Participating Centers, the Gender Lead (a non-CGIAR staff), a representative of an external implementing partner from the NGO sector, and the CRP Director. In recognition of the concern that staff from Centers other than the Lead Center as well as managing partners should have opportunities to serve as flagship leaders in Phase 2, an open, merit-based, selection process was conducted in July, 2016. An invitation to nominate flagship leaders was sent to the PIM extended team (including Focal Points representing all Centers), CGIAR Science Leaders (CRP Directors and DDGs of the Centers), and active participants from managing partner organizations, along with TORs for the positions. Self-nominations were accepted. 11 nominations were received: 5 for IFPRI staff, 3 for staff from Participating Centers, and 3 for staff from external organizations. All nominees expressed interest for the positions. A selection panel consisting of two members of the SPAP, one external expert, one representative of the Lead Center, and one member of the PMU assigned scores to each nominee according to criteria known to candidates. As per the outcome of this process, IFPRI staff will continue to lead Flagships 1 and 4. Flagship 2 will be co-led by staff from Michigan State University and IFPRI. Flagship 3 will be co-led by staff from Wageningen University and Research Centre and IFPRI. Flagship 5 will be co-led by staff from CIFOR and IFPRI. Flagship 6 will be led by a staff member from Oxford University.
It appears as if PIM is more outward facing in its ambitions rather than focused on system-wide strengthening, collaboration and the exploitation of inter-CRPs’ synergies to deliver the SRF.	PIM does indeed contribute to the work of the development community as a whole. This is consistent with the broad partnership strategy of CGIAR, and recognition that CGIAR is but one player in a constellation of contributors to rural prosperity, better health and nutrition, and stewardship of natural resources. PIM contributes to strengthening of the CGIAR portfolio by working to improve the enabling policy environment that underpins its success and through the several communities of practice to strengthen the research outputs of other CRPs. We have added clarifying language to show PIM’s contribution to the system in Section 1.0.2 (Figure 1.0.2.1), Section 1.0.3 and Figure 1.0.3.2, Section 1.0.7 and Figure 1.0.7.1.

Comment	Response
The entire budget of FP1, FP2, FP4 and FP6 is for IFPRI according to the budget tables; with about 25% of FP5 and less than 0.4% of FP3 allocated to Centers other than IFPRI. 95% of the PIM budget is allocated to IFPRI.	Revisions of the text, Annex 3.7 Tables 1 and 2a, and the budget presentation have been made to address the concerns about funding for Participating Centers and external partners. In the indicative budget, 65% of PIM's W1-2 research funds are allocated to the Lead Center, and 35% to Participating Centers and partners. In Phase 1 IFPRI mobilized proportionately more Window 3/bilateral funds than did Participating Centers, with the result that about 80% of research funding from all sources was spent by IFPRI, and 20% by other Centers. In Phase 2 we will encourage and provide technical support to Centers to mobilize Window 3/bilateral funds in the same proportion relative to Window 1-2 funds as IFPRI. This should assure an increased contribution of Participating Centers to the program. In the indicative budget across sources of funding and years 76% of research funds are allocated to/mobilized by the Lead Center and 24% allocated to/mobilized by Participating Centers and partners. These proportions are indicative, and will be adjusted as mobilization of Window 3/bilateral resources on the part of Participating Centers becomes known.
What is not quite so clear is the strategy for selection of core and peripheral collaborators. The proposal would have been stronger if it had discussed the principles on the basis of which partners have been selected, and the strategy for monitoring of partners' roles and output.	PIM selects partners in accordance with the concept of comparative advantage as described in Section 1.0.8. At the flagship level, research partners are selected because of demonstrated excellence, unique attributes or engagement in processes, and/or to build their capacity to carry on with work once PIM exits a field of inquiry. Implementation partners are selected because they are located strategically along an impact pathway and engaged in the policy process or implementation of programs. Language added to Section 1.0.3, Section 1.0.8, and Annex 3.2 about the choice of partners is intended to clarify this.

- **Comments on Flagship 1**

Comment	Response
To complement the quantitative modelling exercise, the FP team might consider developing more descriptive/qualitative scenarios.	Qualitative analysis is used to select scenarios for quantitative modeling. PIM has worked with CCAFS and regional stakeholders in Phase 1 to develop and link qualitative scenarios with quantitative modeling, and will continue to work with decision makers and stakeholders to link qualitative and quantitative approaches in Phase 2. The flagship narrative has been revised to note this.
There are, however, still questions about the role PIM will play with respect to both technology adoption and impact analysis, in particular, the specific scope of effort, its comparative advantage (as highlighted in the previous commentary), and how it relates to other CRPs. It needs to be clarified if the same portfolio of work proposed in the pre-proposal is maintained, though scaled back and no longer functioning as a CoA, or whether the specific roles and activities have been reconsidered, along with the budget.	PIM's contribution on technology adoption focuses on the role of policy reform and institutional and market innovations (e.g., seed regulations, targeted subsidies, ICT-enabled extension). This approach complements attention in AFS CRPs to determinants of adoption and costs/returns of CGIAR-supported technologies and practices. This will require that PIM conduct field-level analysis in close partnership with other Centers and CRPs as well as other partners, e.g., public research and extension organizations, non-governmental organizations, and private companies. We plan to prioritize such research in CGIAR countries of collaboration to facilitate linkages with AFS CRPs, and focus analyses on instances where identifiable policy, institutional, or market innovations have implications for the wider CGIAR portfolio and provide sufficient scope for analysis.
No budget has been allocated to any non-IFPRI CGIAR Center.	See response to comments on the budget presentation made in the general section. 40% of the Flagship 1 budget is allocated to CGIAR Centers other than the Lead Center and to outside partners.

- **Comments on Flagship 2**

Comment	Response
The agenda of CoA 1 appeared to be a collection of a wide range of topics (but missing some key ones) that did not reflect a clear strategic choice, but rather seemed to be chosen based on the existing skill set within IFPRI. There was also little mention of the large CSSPs and how they were feeding into the FP and overall CRP agenda. Those are now referred to several times in the FP2 narrative, though more could be said about the relationship between CSSPs and PIM's research agenda.	The issues addressed in Flagship 2 are at the heart of the growth agenda for agriculture-dependent countries, especially in Africa. CSSPs program their resources in direct discussion with governmental partners. Many issues are congruent with the topics covered in PIM, but PIM does not impose a research program on national partners or on the CSSPs. PIM is sometimes able to assist the CSSPs to broaden the agenda; e.g., to include gender or youth in a study that did not have an explicit focus on inclusion. PIM can bring Centers other than IFPRI to contribute to work requested by a national counterpart from a CSSP. PIM can also draw cross-national links between and among studies undertaken at the national level through CSSPs. CSSPs provide valuable entry to important national stakeholders. For example, when the ISPC invited PIM to organize a session at the Science Forum in April of 2016, PIM was able to do so through the excellent connections of the Ethiopia CSSP.
While some key areas have been brought into the agenda, e.g., farm size, the team has stated that "issues associated with inclusive growth that both attract bilateral funding and draw on staff capacity receive preferential treatment in FP2, which is consistent with comparative advantage and the constrained funding environment." The ISPC does not agree that this argument should be used to define the strategic agenda of FP2.	The language about bilateral funding was misleading, and has been removed. The work of Flagship 2 is largely in Africa south of the Sahara, where countries, development partners, and now CGIAR through the country collaboration mechanism work together to meet objectives set at the national level consistent with commitments under CAADP and the Malabo Declaration. Funding and design of work follows agreement on the priorities. Thus it is neither W1-2 of PIM nor bilateral agencies that set the research agenda, but rather the national stakeholders and coordinated donors. PIM responds to the demand of the coordinated stakeholders. At present demand is concentrated in the areas developed in Flagship 2; that is, inclusive rural transformation, job creation, allocation of public expenditure and tracking of impact, and the political economy of late-transforming countries.

Comment	Response
A stronger justification for comparative advantage is needed. Other groups (J-PAL, 3ie, World Bank and university-based researchers) are involved in analysis of employment issues in developing countries. A clearer articulation of PIM's comparative advantage in this field would be useful in providing a stronger rationale for the specific topics of research in which this FP proposes to engage.	The language on comparative advantage has been strengthened. Few organizations except for CGIAR have the necessary mandate, research skills, and convening power on these issues. PIM's partnership with FAO's Rural Employment team was motivated by their observation that most researchers working on jobs do not focus on agricultural or rural employment. Indeed, an online search revealed that only 58 (0.6%) of Institute for the Study of Labor's (IZA) 10,023 discussion papers since 1998 mention "agriculture" or "farming" in their abstracts; and only 29 (1.2%) of the 3ie database of 2,500 impact evaluations and 3 (1.7%) of JPAL's 173 agriculture/labor market studies mention both "agriculture" and "employment." More importantly, few research organizations have the CGIAR's in-country policy experience, and most research does not consider both demand and supply-side factors affecting employment. Of the groups listed by the ISPC, only the World Bank has comparable research strength and policy engagement, but there, too, little attention is accorded to rural employment. (In a previous assignment the PIM Director wrote a chapter on youth employment in agriculture in Africa for a WB volume when it became apparent that the staffing of the study team did not include skills to cover agriculture.) The overall rationale for the selection of topics in Flagship 2 is addressed in the revised version of the proposal.
The political economy work in CoA 3 looks promising, and is welcome, particularly given that so much of this CRP is built on TOC and IP that are tenuous. It is surprising not to see some mention of ideas being revived of problem-driven adaptive iteration (Andrews et al.), nor to the work led by David Booth and colleagues on doing development differently, i.e., working from positive deviance to induce generalised propositions.	The presentation of the ToC has been revised, as noted above. Neither the TOC nor the IP is tenuous, although both are subject to risk and random occurrences as noted in the proposal. We agree that the referenced work by Andrews et al. and Booth offer important insights, and they have influenced the Cluster 2.3 team. To further acknowledge their importance, we have included reference to David Booth's as well as Brian Levy's work on "going with the grain." What this concept means operationally for influencing evidence-based agricultural policy change is not entirely clear, and a useful topic for the Cluster 2.3 team to address. Similarly, Matt Andrews and Lant Pritchett's work on "isomorphic mimicry" and problem-driven adaptive iteration offers a refreshingly new lens on how to achieve institutional reform. The revised flagship proposal highlights how we will incorporate these authors' insights, as well as those of Peter Evans on "institutional monocropping," into Cluster 2.3's work on public sector reforms in Africa.

Comment	Response
Structural change in SSA is a major development issue. The central research problem is the absence of industrialization. Looking at transformation only in Africa, as this FP does, risks ignoring key processes being seen in Asia and Latin America. In some influential circles there is a fierce concentration on raising agricultural productivity and closing yields gaps which, while important, is only one part of agricultural and rural development in Africa. Comparisons made across Asia and Africa are often ahistorical: the idea that Africa cannot industrialise through labour-intensive manufacturing rests in large part on a faulty logic that history does not corroborate. As China's wages rise, opportunities for manufacturing in Africa mount. Given this analysis, the FP may wish to consider broadening its outlook here.	The team agrees that cross-country experience with structural and rural transformation is informative. The team already draws upon existing research from Asia and Latin America. Funding realities in Phase 2 are likely to constrain the amount of work that PIM can do outside of CGIAR countries of collaboration. Inclusion of Vietnam (a country of collaboration) allows us to explore the Asian experience while enriching shared CGIAR efforts. Bangladesh and India (additional countries of collaboration) also offer useful lessons. The text of the flagship narrative has been revised to note that cross-country learning from East and South Asia will be pursued as resources permit. In addition, IFPRI's office in China and good connections with Chinese research organizations allow continued partnership without commitment of too many resources. The reviewer notes, "As China's wages rise, opportunities for manufacturing in Africa mount." Whether this is true, or instead China's firms will automate or outsource to Southeast Asian neighbors, is an open and important question. The work of Flagship 2 is structured to assess the issue from the African side, to understand the pace and composition of job creation and the role of Chinese and other investors. We participate regularly in fora and conferences that address the question with reference to China's changing labor market. We also examine the experience with youth employment in other countries; for example, an ongoing PIM project on rural youth employment in Africa includes historical studies of Brazil and Bangladesh.
The FP adopts the approach of defining questions by diagnosis of problems, i.e., identify the problem, study the causes, and find policies and programs to remedy them. This makes sense, but the FP may also wish to consider an alternative approach using 'positive deviance' – e.g. based on assessments of cases of success that have occurred, and especially when success has been achieved in unpromising circumstances.	Working from positive deviance is implicitly integrated into the work of Cluster 2.3 on political economy. Finding where there have been positive cases of policy change or "islands" of public sector effectiveness in a sea of low public sector capacity underlies the rationale to pursue qualitative case of successful reform. Similarly, Cluster 2.1's diagnostic approach includes studies of success at national and subnational levels. Other areas of the flagship may expand into such a methodological approach depending on resources. The description of the flagship's approach has been broadened in Section 2.2.1.3.

• **Comments on Flagship 3**

Comment	Response
While there is some past evidence of cross CRP collaboration within the foresight modelling work of FP1 (and to a lesser extent in value chains and NRM communities of practice), and frequent passing references to intentions to collaborate on various topics with other CRPs, for the most part, it is missing.	The Flagship 3 team has conducted additional discussions with the AFS CRPs, and agreed on modalities of collaboration as listed below: • With RTB (FP4, FP5), FTA (FP2, FP3), A4NH (FP3), FISH, WHEAT, and MAIZE on measurement of postharvest losses; • With RTB, FTA, and A4NH on interventions to improve participation of women in VCs; • With FTA on value chains for forest and tree-crop products (e.g. inclusion, scaling, innovation, SME development); • With RTB on the value chain hubs in Peru and Senegal, and with LIVESTOCK on the VC hub in Ethiopia. This is reflected in the revised flagship narrative (Section 2.3.1.7) and in Annex 3.7. The team will seek additional cross-CRP collaboration as mutual interest and resources permit.
Some of the FP narratives do allude to complementarities with other FPs. But it is still not entirely clear, for example, how foresight researchers will work with value chain partners or how the outputs of each would be used by the others. The same applies to the post-harvest technology work and statistics support.	Although the linkages between the work on value chains and foresight modeling are implicit and logical (promising future technologies targeted for early development will require well-performing value chains to reach their potential), time horizons differ between the two topics. Value chain analysis is more closely related to adoption of presently available technologies than to technologies in the development stages. The foresight work, in addition to developing guidance for investment in research, offers insight into geographies of promising adoption for existing technologies. In this area the two bodies of work are complementary, and work together. The work on seed systems in Flagship 1 is closely linked to analysis of input supply within value chains in Flagship 3. Similarly, reduction of postharvest losses improves returns to new technologies. Analysis of the evolution of value chains during the process of rural transformation brings Flagships 2 and 3 together. Flagships 3 and 6 are linked through the application of tools for gender analysis in value chains and the use of the WEAI to track gender impacts of interventions to strengthen value chains.
Budget - The proposal would be strengthened by inclusion of more detail, particularly for the value-chain activity.	Budgets have been framed in reference to historic costs applied to the work programs described. The budget narratives for each flagship (Sections 2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2, 2.5.2, 2.6.2) include brief descriptions of the levels and categories of costs. Budgets for all flagships are indicative, and will be developed in greater detail during annual planning exercises when levels of actual funding are clearer. We have noted in an earlier communication to the ISPC that a significant share of W1-2 funds has been allocated to non-IFPRI partners. With the new approach to entering “budget by partner” data, the budgetary concern of the ISPC should be alleviated.

Comment	Response
Also, the research agenda appeared quite distinct from what the rest of the CRPs were doing, particularly in terms of integrating smallholders into domestic value chains that link farmers to processors. With respect to the latter, PIM had developed in Phase 1 a multi-center CoP for value chain research that it claims has strong linkages to other CRPs.	Links to other CRPs in Phase 1 through the CoP were largely at the individual level, as members of the CoP participated both in PIM and in other CRPs, often those led by their home Centers. In planning for Phase 2, the links have been strengthened at the programmatic level through discussions with CRP Directors. The presentation of the coherence of the research agenda and complementarity with work of other CRPs has been enhanced through addition of Figure 2.3.1.6.1 “Linking smallholders to markets through value chain research,” showing key nodes in the value chain, recurrent constraints at each node, and potential interventions to address the constraints. Each of the nodes of the value chain presented in Figure 2.3.1.6.1 is local or domestic, although the ultimate customer or consumer could be an exporter. The fact that trade is covered in Flagship 3 does not diminish the focus of the teams on domestic and local value chains. One innovative feature of the flagship is application of tools developed for trade work (Producer Support Estimates or Nominal Rates of Assistance) to diagnostic assessment of domestic and local value chains.
There is some evidence of this for a few CRPs in Table 2.7.1 (Key partnerships with other CRPs) but it is not obvious from Annex 3.7 where PIM describes what the FP provides and receives from each of the eight AFS CRPs and CCAFS. In each case the description is fairly non-specific and always the same. More specificity might be expected here reflecting the differential progress made with each CRP.	Annex 3.7 has been revised to reflect specific agreements for joint work and collaboration.
PIM indicates it intends to strengthen the linkages with CRPs during Phase 2, although no funds have been allocated to this end (co-investment is planned). It will be essential that PIM comes to the table seeking to both contribute to and receive from other CRPs to the CGIAR’s greater advantage. The mechanism and strategy that will be used to achieve this needs greater clarification.	As noted above, ties with other CRPs at an individual level through the CoP will be retained and expanded with additional members of the CoP. These members all participate in other CRPs as well as in PIM. In addition to individual links, programmatic links with other CRPs have been strengthened through consultation at the CRP Director level to ascertain areas of further engagement. Measurement and management of postharvest losses is an area of shared interest, and the work will be expanded through co-investment and parallel funding, with PIM providing leadership in design of research methods and coordination and other CRPs taking leadership in testing of interventions to address losses in their specific value chains. The value chains hubs will be another mechanism for collaboration, and other CRPs are invited to use the hubs to share results and convene partners. The value chain web site is available for other CRPs to use to post their results and methods, and to access material on useful tools.

Comment	Response
There are other issues related to the agenda that merit attention. While this FP focuses on value chains, there is little in the narrative that actually describes the typical issues that arise with them. In most cases, the pressing problems where markets fail concern input supply and financial services. If that is correct, then more of the work under this program should be focused on these issues. Rural finance probably deserves special attention. The supermarket revolution is another area which should probably be emphasized more in the narrative of this FP.	Figure 2.3.1.6.1 has been added to show the main constraints that characterize different nodes in value chains. Finance and input supply are important, but not the only constraints. Issues of information asymmetry, contractual forms, infrastructure gaps, and others noted in Figure 2.3.1.6.1 are also important. The supermarket revolution is one element of the changing context that sends a pulse backward along the value chain, triggering changes in each node and requiring interventions of the kind shown in the figure; for example, new approaches to aggregation, contracting, demands on rural producers' organizations, and new mechanisms for meetings grades and standards. This work is already included in the PIM portfolio, as, for example, in the work of colleagues from CIP on placing native potatoes and processed products in supermarkets through the methods developed under the framework of the Participatory Market Chain Approach (PMCA). PIM's current portfolio of evaluations of value chain interventions is informed by inputs from the CoP members. PIM will continue to improve tools and build capacity to identify priority problems in value chains so that other CRPs may apply them widely for their own use and for shaping future work of PIM.
It is still not that clear what added value CoA 3 (Approaches to VC improvement at scale) brings to CoA 2. While it is true there are things to learn about how small-scale pilots become large-scale programs (Korten, 1980) it is not at all evident that it warrants a separate cluster of activity.	This comment from the ISPC initiated a further round of discussion within the PIM team and with two major external partners (Wageningen University and Research Centre and USAID) to consider the relative merits of removing or retaining the cluster. At the strong request of partners, we have decided to retain it with a strengthened justification. The approach that will be adopted is to collaborate with development programs already working at scale and with private firms to assess the effectiveness of interventions included in their programs. Often interventions are designed in a specific context without clear specification of the parameters of intervention or the contextual constraints that they are addressing. Under these circumstances, even when good baseline and endline data are available, it is difficult to discern why the observed impacts are or are not achieved. The work of Cluster 3.3 will undertake research in different contexts to learn where and why interventions are more likely to achieve results. This will be done with varying degrees of technical rigor depending on the need in a given setting. The findings will also provide richer end-of-project assessments for the implementation partners, both AFS CRPs and development agencies. The resources assigned to this cluster are modest, and most work will be done with co-funding by implementation partners.

Comment	Response
The scientific quality of the research proposed is high, except that it is not particularly new or innovative. There were some methodological issues raised by the ISPC in its pre-proposal commentary, particularly for CoA 1 which the full proposal has defended in its response and has provided further details about the methods in CoA 3. The scientific team is strong and represents a good balance of IFPRI, other CGIAR Center (CIP, ICRAF, Worldfish, CIAT, Bioversity) and Wageningen University researchers, all with good publications records. The comparative advantage is clearly high for CoA 1 but it is not at all that clear that PIM (or IFPRI) has a comparative advantage in the other two CoAs. Much will depend on how effectively linkages are formed and how productive the collaborations between PIM and other CRPs are.	In addition to innovation in research, a program can make an important contribution by applying known high quality methods to new data to answer long-standing questions, such as, “What is causing excess margins along a given value chain?” Applying known methods in new settings often requires innovations in application. This is the case in diagnostic assessments of value chains to discover where the greatest losses are occurring and where interventions can deliver the most gain. Flagship 3 includes innovative work in measurement of postharvest losses, strategic prioritization of value chain interventions, and scaling-up of interventions. We agree that the comparative advantage of PIM in Cluster 3.2 is enhanced through inclusion of scientists from CGIAR and Wageningen University and Research Centre as a strategic partner.

- **Comments on Flagship 4**

Comment	Response
The main issue here, which has been raised previously, is the extent to which this subject area forms an obvious element of the CRP portfolio, or of the broader CGIAR portfolio. While social protection schemes are important for reducing poverty, their link to agricultural research is not obvious. Comparative advantage is the primary concern here. PIM was asked to provide a stronger rationale for this FP in the full proposal, which it has not yet done. The full proposal presents a partial but not completely convincing case for why FP4 on social protection belongs within PIM, or indeed within the CGIAR.	In response to this comment from the ISPC, we have substantially revised and clarified the rationale for PIM and the CGIAR to undertake this work, and expanded the work program on social protection and agriculture to strengthen its relevance to CGIAR. We have changed the flagship name to signal the importance of work on social protection for the resilience agenda. We renewed discussions with CCAFS about collaboration on research on climate change and safety nets in addition to the planned collaboration on climate change and insurance. Finally, we sought additional feedback from stakeholders at FAO about the research proposed under this flagship, and confirmed their view of the importance of continued work by CGIAR in this area. The SRF commits CGIAR to work toward “increased resilience of the poor to climate change and other shocks” as a contributor to poverty reduction. If the instruments for achieving this are to be limited to agricultural research narrowly defined, then interventions will be only in the sphere of technical agriculture, such as drought, heat, and flood-resistant crops and breeds, and new management techniques. As we have previously argued, even significantly accelerated growth in yields and drought/heat/flood tolerance will leave millions of people subject to shocks that increase poverty, erode health and nutrition, and contribute to degradation of natural resources. Relying only on agricultural research narrowly construed puts each of the SLOs at risk. PIM’s research on social protection has already had impact on the design of large programs, and has produced highly regarded publications on the effect of social protection on agriculture, including impact on agricultural productivity and input use, livestock holdings, and adoption of technology (see references in the flagship 4 narrative). Social protection programs are growing in number and size, particularly in Africa south of the Sahara, and provide an important opportunity to build linkages with agricultural production, particularly in the early period of implementation when program design is still somewhat fluid. Social protection programs influence agricultural opportunities for hundreds of millions of smallholders and laborers in agriculture-dependent countries by alleviating credit constraints, reducing distressed sales of productive assets, often increasing demand for labor, and changing food prices. The work program set out in the proposal is ambitious but feasible, and important for attainment of the SLOs.

Comment	Response
Of the three research questions framing the scope of FP4 work, only the first makes a direct connection between social protection programs and their influence on agricultural growth and nutrition. Much other work in this FP would have a very indirect link to agricultural research. The CRP has argued that PIM's comparative advantage in addressing social protection derives from the ability to probe the complementarity of social protection and agricultural production thanks to linkages with the broader agricultural agenda of CGIAR. This makes sense; but how much of the research agenda this applies to in reality is not evident, although the CRP has made a serious effort to give a new orientation in this direction. Further elaboration on how each of the CoAs outputs capitalize on this connection between social protection and agriculture would strengthen the comparative advantage argument. There are important topics that need to be explored, e.g., how do public works programs affect labour allocation in relation to agriculture? How can producers' consumption be protected through social protection mechanisms in ways that don't distort market prices for foods, but the case hasn't been made here sufficiently. PIM no doubt does have competitive advantage in some parts of this agenda, but the work as currently proposed appears to duplicate work being done in several other institutions, including the World Bank, UNDP, OECD and ILO.	In the revised proposal we have adjusted the work program to emphasize linkages with agricultural production. In addition we have changed the flagship name to signal the importance of work on social protection and insurance for the resilience agenda. The research agenda now has greater emphasis on complementarity between social protection and investments in agriculture and nutrition. The work will measure the effects of social protection on agricultural technology adoption, input use, cropping patterns, and holdings of livestock and productive assets. Other topics will include the impact of public works on agricultural labor supply, the effect of cash and food transfer modalities on food prices, and whether positive effects of transfers on women's empowerment identified in Phase 1 (Hidrobo et al. 2016) also affect the allocation of productive assets between men and women in the household, a major source of productive inefficiency. Research on the effects of social protection on human capital and intrahousehold allocation of resources is expected to yield insights into agricultural labor productivity and the division of labor within the household. Most of the institutions noted in the ISPC comments (World Bank, UNDP, OECD and ILO) do little on the relation between social protection and agriculture. FAO worked closely with IFPRI on the 2015 SOFA report, "Social Protection and Agriculture: Breaking the Cycle of Poverty," precisely because little of the other work in the field of social protection addresses agricultural issues.

- **Comments on Flagship 5**

Comment	Response
An area that probably deserves more attention here is land markets and how they are evolving, not the formal land markets, but the informal one.	Flagship 5 works on customary as well as statutory, informal as well as formal tenure regimes. The interplay between the formal and informal markets is addressed jointly by Flagship 2 and Flagship 5. The work on changing farm size in Flagship 2 requires survey work on acquisition of land for farming and terms of use in which both formal and informal modes of acquisition are documented.
Other resource issues that the FP might consider as important (and researchable) topics include: (i) Competition and cooperation over water: in Africa wherever water is available and used for irrigation, the governance of the water is a live issue. More cooperative models must be possible; (ii) Peri-urban challenges: multiple demands for land for farming, housing, infrastructure, industry and green space make the issues of fair and efficient rights all the more demanding; (iii) Climate change: Involving smallholders in reducing emissions and capturing carbon in their farming systems. Monitoring, reporting and verification of such capture is challenging but this seems to be a prime area for collaboration with CCAFS.	Flagship 5 works on institutions for management of water, particularly within shared landscapes. The emphasis on water is not as strong as that on land, but water has historically been part of the agenda of CAPRI, and will continue to be included. The team coordinates with WLE to assure complementarity without duplication. The Flagship 5 team works with Flagship 2 on issues of rural-urban linkages and changing demands for land and water. PIM has worked with CCAFS on institutional issues associated with adoption of climate-smart technologies, but the work of measuring and monitoring emissions is undertaken by CCAFS.

- **Comments on Flagship 6**

No comment that called for a response

5.2 FEWG Criteria of Evaluation and Where to Look for the Corresponding Material in the Proposal

Flagship review criteria (based on 11 July 2016 version)	Sections of the PIM proposal
1. Potential Impact a. Have the proposed impacts pathways of the research – community (social, economic, environmental), capacity building or scientific impacts – been clearly identified and are they feasible? b. Who stands to benefit? (numbers of households, farmers and/or consumers, in which regions/countries/agro-ecological zones, etc.) c. If relevant, is the design (including partnerships) supportive of delivering impact within 5-10 years or > 10 years? (high/ medium/ low)	- <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.3, 2.2.1.3, 2.3.1.3, 2.4.1.3, 2.5.1.3, 2.6.1.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change (for each FP).</i> - <i>Specific partnerships formed to facilitate achievement of outcomes are highlighted in flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i> PIM expects to impact a range of beneficiaries including urban consumers, value chain actors, common property natural resource users, rural laborers, farmers and especially smallholder farmers. Efforts are made to target women and the youth in each of these categories. Given the main SLO targets that PIM contributes to (technology adoption, productivity increase, and poverty reduction), PIM's quantitative contribution to SLO targets in Table A is expressed solely in terms of number of rural farming households. We have elaborated a fairly comprehensive methodology to estimate numbers of beneficiary rural farming households (Annex 3.11.7). - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives.</i> - <i>Annex 3.2 Partnership Strategy.</i> <u>Flagship 1</u>: Work on foresight modeling can have short-term impact on investment decisions for agriculture, which will yield impact on SLOs over a period >10 years. Analysis of seed systems, extension methods, and regulatory reforms can yield impact in 3-10 years. <u>Flagship 2</u>: Work on political economy can have short-term impact on current or upcoming policy cycles. Budget cycles often operate on the 3-5 year cycle of Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks; thus work on

	public expenditure can have impact in that time frame. Policy reform to stimulate rural transformation and job creation will have impact in 3-8 years. <u>Flagship 3</u>: Trade negotiations can drag on for years with no apparent progress, and then suddenly reach critical decision points. For that reason it is important to have analytical tools ready to deploy on short notice. Impact will follow within 2-5 years of new agreements. Analysis of weak links in value chains and remedial interventions can take 2-3 years, with implementation following thereafter. Impact can be expected in the 5-10 year range. Scaling up could take place in the 5-10 year period on a selective basis. <u>Flagship 4</u>: Changes in design of ongoing social protection programs can take place over a period of one year after analysis of options for change (2-3 years). Impact could thus be expected in a period of 3-5 years. Design of new programs can also be undertaken in the same period, with one year for design and one year for introduction of new programs. Insurance products can be offered on a pilot basis within a year after research indicates likelihood of commercial success. The time frame for impact of research on insurance is therefore from to 5-10 years. <u>Flagship 5</u>: Many development projects on land administration are implemented over a horizon of 5 years, hence changes in tenure take place within the range of 5-10 years. Similarly, institutional arrangements for management of shared landscapes can be implemented as soon as they are agreed by the affected groups, so the 5-10 year time frame (or less) is appropriate. <u>Flagship 6</u>: Changes in opportunities for women can be implemented within the 5-10 year window if included in design of investment projects or other programs. Changes in norms and expected behaviors may take a generation, but can be hastened by successes with interventions implemented over a shorter period. It is reasonable to expect changes in gender opportunities following upon research results within a 5-10 year period.
d. Is there organizational buy-in from implementing or scale-up partners? (high/ medium/ low)	- <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i>
e. Does it explicitly outline how gender considerations will be incorporated into the research objectives, methodology and implementation	- <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.4 Gender.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.9, 2.2.1.9, 2.3.1.9, 2.4.1.9, 2.5.1.9, 2.6.1.9 Gender.</i> - <i>Annex 3.4 Gender Strategy.</i>

Flagship review criteria (based on 11 July 2016 version)	Sections of the PIM proposal
2. Strategic importance, logistical viability and governance a. Is there strong alignment between the proposed interventions or research products and established diagnoses of challenges/problems? Are the problems, the priorities, the justification for the flagship and the proposed collaborators clearly articulated? b. Are appropriate partners identified and roles adequately defined? (including private sector and NGOs etc.) c. Are institutional arrangements and management clearly articulated and reasonable (e.g., cost-effective)?	- <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.1 Rationale and Scope.</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.3, 2.2.1.3, 2.3.1.3, 2.4.1.3, 2.5.1.3, 2.6.1.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change (for each FP).</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i> - <i>Annex 3.2 Partnership Strategy.</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.11 Program Management and Governance.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.12, 2.2.1.12, 2.3.1.12, 2.4.1.12, 2.5.1.12, 2.6.1.12 FP Management.</i> - <i>CRP budget narrative Section</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.1.4 CRP Management and Support Costs.</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.1.5 Financial Management Principles.</i>

Flagship review criteria (based on 11 July 2016 version)	Sections of the PIM proposal
3. Comparative Advantage and cost effectiveness/value for money a. Are there alternatives sources of supply for the proposed research? (Yes/No) b. Will funding this research through the CGIAR deliver a greater gain than funding other organizations or other research to tackle the identified problem? c. How well aligned is the research with the unique assets and strengths of the CGIAR? d. Is the scale of investment in the research commensurate with the proposed outcomes and scale of impact? (justify the scale of the budget)	- <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.8 Partnerships and Comparative Advantage.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.6, 2.2.1.6, 2.3.1.6, 2.4.1.6, 2.5.1.6, 2.6.1.6 Clusters of activities.</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.3 Impact Pathway and Theory of Change.</i> - <i>CRP narrative Section 1.0.8 Partnerships and Comparative Advantage.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.7, 2.2.1.7, 2.3.1.7, 2.4.1.7, 2.5.1.7, 2.6.1.7 Partnerships.</i> - <i>Flagship narratives Sections 2.1.1.6, 2.2.1.6, 2.3.1.6, 2.4.1.6, 2.5.1.6, 2.6.1.6 Clusters of activities.</i> - <i>Annex 3.7 Linkages with Other CRPs and Site Integration, Tables 1 and 2a.</i> The PIM program aims to deliver an economic rate of return of 12% overall, which is commensurate with targets for development programs generally (see CRP narrative Section 1.0.2). A fraction of the PIM research yields very high returns (e.g., modeling that underpinned the recent agreement to end export subsidies under the Doha Round; research contributing to removal of the export ban on maize in Tanzania in 2012). Interventions that help target investment in agricultural research also yield high ERR (see, for example, Fuglie et. al (2013) on returns to CGIAR research, and Byerlee et al (2010). PIM researchers are encouraged to select topics likely to yield concrete impact. In Phase 2 an increasing proportion of the program's investments will be directed to (a) countries with significant participation of other CRPs and Centers, and (b) issues of importance to other CRPs. Therefore, PIM is expected to have greater indirect impact through the work of other CRPs than was the case during Phase 1.

Flagship review criteria (based on 11 July 2016 version)	Sections of the PIM proposal
4. Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) a. Does the plan for ME&L provide sufficient information for interim assessment or review of whether incremental progress is being made? b. Does the ME&L plan where applicable, even for upstream research, sufficiently map to progress in product development? c. Is it clear which outcomes of the research will be measureable within the timeframe of the flagship/CRPs?	- <i>Annex 3.6 Results Based Management</i> - <i>Performance Indicators Matrix Table D</i> All flagships conduct research that leads to actionable recommendations that aim to influence policy, institution and market decisions. The MEL plan applies to all flagships. - <i>Annex 3.6 Results Based Management</i> - <i>Performance Indicators Matrix Table D</i> Annual milestones for each flagship are shown in Table D of the Performance Indicators Matrix. Annex 3.6 also provides indicators of importance to PIM. Further discussions at CGIAR level through the Monitoring and Evaluation Community of Practice will attempt to streamline outcome measurement across all CRPs.