5. Responses to comments from reviewers of the FTA Phase II Full proposal

5.1 Response to ISPC comments

The ISPC also requests that the CRP proponents take note of all the comments, but in particular provide an addendum which addresses the points highlighted below and rewritten sections as requested below.

- *The mismatch between evidence of documented historical impacts, and expected future impacts, is stark. Even though targets are overly optimistic for many CRPs, FTA is an outlier among all CRPs regarding targets that lack credibility, particularly the one relating to the number of farmers likely to be lifted out of poverty. Sections of the proposal which refer to targets or provide justification for the figures quoted need to be rewritten. The revised CRP should have a stronger rationale for targets, including past evidence, especially for SLO 1.*
    - Addressed by 'must have' #4
- *While the team of FP leaders is impressive, FTA directorship has been unclear for some time, and despite expectations that a director would be appointed in late 2015 this has not been resolved. ("At the date of submission, the DDG-Research of CIFOR is the acting FTA director as the position is under recruitment" p. 38). The uncertainty regarding this vacancy should be resolved before 31 July 2016.*
    - Addressed by 'must have' #5
- *The proponents should attach an annex that clarifies site integration plans with respect to the role of the sentinel landscapes, including results from Phase 1.*
    - Addressed by 'must have' #3
- *The revised proposal should do more to strengthen the argument for why the individual FPs add up to more than the sum of the parts. To this end, an additional annex describing the priority-setting process that was applied to the planning of the CRP, and the results of the process, is requested.*
    - Addressed by 'must have' #1 and #2

'Must have' ISPC requests

#	ISPC request	FTA response and action
Individual FPs add up to a CRP that offers more value than the sum of individual FPs		
1	The ISPC requests a revision of the proposal to strengthen the argument for why the individual FPs add up to more than the sum of their parts	We have completely revised the CRP narrative *Section 1.0.6 – Program structure and Flagship Projects* and developed a new figure that illustrate the interrelations between FPs. The narrative developed for the 'niche' in *Annex 3.18* (Other Comments #1) also explains the comparative advantage of FTA as a program compared to various individual centers.
2	An additional annex describing the priority-setting process that was applied to the planning of the CRP, and the results of the process, is requested	We have created *Annex 3.18 – FTA's niche and priority setting*, which clearly defines the FTA niche and the priority-setting processes at three levels: 1) the whole CRP; 2) the FPs and CoAs; and 3) bilateral projects.
Site integration		
3	The ISPC requests the CRP to provide an annex that outlines site integration plans and the role of the sentinel landscapes in the revised proposal. Issues	We developed an Annex 3.19 - *Creating a data-driven network of socio-ecological indicators across the Global Tropics* that details the requested

#	ISPC request	FTA response and action
	that should be covered include a description of the datasets that are currently being collected in sentinel landscapes. The variables being monitored; their frequency and starting year in which data collection commenced; their unit of observation, should all be described. In addition, some indication of where this process be more broadly useful to the CGIAR beyond the needs of the CRP should be provided	information about the Sentinel Landscapes. We have updated the narrative of Section 1.0.7 – *Cross CRP collaboration and site integration* to synthetize our involvement in the site integration process including the Sentinel Landscapes. The detailed information about site integration is in the Template 2b of Annex 3.7.
Theory of Change and Impact Pathway		
4	The ISPC requests the CRP to provide a revision to the proposal that has: a) stronger rationale for targets, especially for SLO 1; and b) as needed, rewriting the proposal to be consistent with any revisions.	Given the magnitude of the areas and populations living in and/or depending from FT&A systems, we believe our targets were realistic. However, we recognize the need to look more closely at the potential overlaps among FPs in particular countries. Originally, we used an additive model, in which we calculated the sum of the targets across a FP for one country. But in light of the reviewers comments, we agree that it seems more reasonable to use a combined model, as the beneficiaries are likely to be same – at least partially – when several FPs operate in a country. A completely revised *Annex 3.12 – Assumptions and evidence used to develop aspirational targets* provides a stronger rationale as well as revised assumptions behind our targets, supported by examples of past achievements. Each target now details the total target population, how FTA research can bring solutions, our expected contribution based on FTA Phase I, the geographic coverage and existing portfolio of activities, examples of past or current achievements, and caveats wherever relevant. *Section 1.0.2 – Goals, objectives, targets* has also been revised and updated with the new revised targets values. PIM Table A has been updated in the online tool and the aligned proposal document.
Leadership and partnership		
5	The uncertainty regarding this (FTA Director's position) vacancy should be resolved before 31 July 2016.	Issues regarding the recruitment a new FTA Director have been carefully considered by the Independent Steering Committee, especially in light of uncertain funding and future scenarios for the CRP (for example, not long ago there were plans to merge FTA with WLE…). However, the Acting Director has assumed full responsibilities during this period of adjustment, and as such

#	ISPC request	FTA response and action
		there has been no void in leadership. Recruitment timeline: • The FTA Director position was still open during the full proposal preparation and closed on 31/03. • A long list was created in concert with the Independent Steering Committee. • A short list was developed and candidates were interviewed by phone in June 2016. • Two potential candidates have been selected and will be interviewed in person by a panel on 1 August 2016. • Depending on the actual fate of FTA and on available funding, the selected candidate will begin at the start of 2017.
Flagships		
6	Given these concerns, the ISPC request that the text on FP1 be re-written. Much more detail and specificity is required about the content of the three clusters of activity, and the theory of change for how these combine to contribute to impacts should be revised to provide greater clarity and realism.	Specific responses are provided below, but we have substantially rewritten the introduction to the flagship and the descriptions of the clusters of activity. Earlier ISPC response (at the pre-proposal stage) had indicated that the Flagship 1 theory of change was the clearest among all the FTA FPs, connecting research activities with key outcomes/potential impacts. Earlier ISPC review also indicated that the key research questions of Flagship 1 were exemplary in their 'researchability' and practical implications, combining a sense of the strategic knowledge required for IPG delivery and how that knowledge will directly contribute to development outcomes. We have made adjustments to the current theory of change and hope that this, along with adjustments to the cluster descriptions, reestablishes this clarity. FP1-specific comments can be found in Other Comments #25–31.
7	Given these concerns, the ISPC request that the text on FP 2 be re-written. The major issue needing attention is the evidence base motivating the Theory of Change / impact pathway for FP2, and for example, realism of the associated targets for numbers of farmers lifted out of poverty	The text of FP2 has been re-written as requested. FP2-specific comments can be found in Other Comments #32–9
8	FP3. The expertise of the leaders in the three clusters of FP3 has not been established, and their track record is not documented – there is a list of references, but it is not clear how many of these stem from the work of FTA Phase 1 or are even linked to the work of FTA staff or partners.	The expertise of the leaders has been explicated as requested. The paragraph describing the team qualifications (*Section 2.3.1.4*) has been rewritten. We have included Table 4 (*Section 2.3.1.4*), which lists 23 key

#	ISPC request	FTA response and action
		scientists to be involved in the implementation of FP3, including their original discipline, H index, number of total citations, their role in FP3, and the full time equivalent (FTE) that will be dedicated to FP3. The CVs of 10 of these scientists are included in Annex 3.8. We have also included Table 6 (*Section 2.3.1.12*), which summarizes the expertise of the FP3 leader along with that of the three FP3 clusters of activity (CoA) leaders, and documents the track record of these scientists to perform the role of CoA leader. In order to ensure that the three CoA leaders will perform efficient, high-quality work, we have decided to appoint focal points from key CGIAR and non-CGIAR managing partners in order to assist the CoA leaders. We will also establish advisory teams involving major non-CGIAR partner organizations for each of the CoA. Table 7 (*Section 2.3.1.12*) provides details on the composition of these teams. FP3-specific comments can be found in Other Comments #40–45.
9	FP4.The ISPC request the proponents to provide references to the highest impact publications that the CRP has published using data from sentinel landscapes in Phase 1.	The major publications using the FTA Phase I data are still in preparation, as datasets are reaching their final stage of completion. A special issue of the *International Journal of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Managemen*t is planned for the second half of 2016 (10 manuscripts currently under review). The best scientific papers published or accepted for publication as of July 2016 are: Ordonez JC, Luedeling E, Kindt R, Tata HL, Harja D, Jamnadass R, van Noordwijk M. 2014. Tree diversity along the forest transition curve: Drivers, consequences and entry points for multifunctional agriculture. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 6:54–60. Sist P, Rutishauser E, Peña-Claros M, Shenkin A, Hérault B, Blanc L, Baraloto C, Baya F, Benedet F, da Silva KE, Descroix L, Ferreira JN, Gourlet-Fleury S, Guedes MC, Bin Harun I, Jalonen R, Kanashiro M, Krisnawati H, Kshatriya M, Lincoln P, Mazzei L, Medjibé V, Nasi R, d'Oliveira MVN, de Oliveira LC, Picard N, Pietsch S, Pinard M, Priyadi H, Putz FE, Rodney K, Rossi V, Roopsind A, Ruschel AR, Shari NHZ, Rodrigues de Souza C, Susanty FH, Sotta ED, Toledo M, Vidal E, West TAP, Wortel V, Yamada T. 2014. The Tropical Managed Forests Observatory: A research network addressing the future of tropical logged forests. *Applied Vegetation Science* 18:171–174. Rutishauser E, Hérault B, Petronelli P and Sist P. 2016. Tree height reduction

#	ISPC request	FTA response and action
		after selective logging in a tropical forest. *Biotropica* 48(3):285–289. Roopsind A, Sist P, Peña-Claros M, Thomas R, Putz FE. 2014. Beyond equitable data sharing to improve tropical forest management. *International Forestry review* 16(4):497–503. van Noordwijk M, Villamor GB. 2014. Tree cover transitions in tropical landscapes: hypotheses and cross-continental synthesis. *Global Land Project Newsletter.* Issue No. 10. http://www.globallandproject.org/newsletter/glp_news.php. Minang PA, van Noordwijk M, Freeman O E, Mbow C, de Leeuw J & Catacutan D. (Eds.) 2015. *Climate-Smart Landscapes: Multifunctionality In Practice*. Nairobi, Kenya: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), 404 pp. Mithöfer D, van Noordwijk M, Leimona B, Cerutti P. 2016. Certify and shift blame, or resolve issues? Environmentally and socially responsible global trade and production of timber and tree crop commodities. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management.* (accepted with minor revisions, status per July 2016) FP4-specific comments can be found in Other Comments #46–49.

Other comments

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
Overall analysis of the full proposal as an integral part of the CRP portfolio		
Strategic relevance		
1	… the proposal does not adequately identify the niche that FTA itself proposes to fill.	We have interpreted this comment as related to the niche occupied by FTA in the non-CGIAR world. *Annex 3.18 – FTA niche and priority setting* includes a new narrative explaining the niche and comparative advantage of the FTA partnership as a program ('must have' #2)
2	strength of scientific arguments and underlying hypotheses are overshadowed by the appearance of an attempt to do too many things	Cf. 'must have' #2 and Recommendations 1 and 2, key elements ('must have') in the Independent Evaluation Report. In the proposed financing plan (Guidance for full proposal), 85% of the funding necessary for the achievement of FTA objectives is from bilateral sources. We proposed a 30%/70% ratio in our original

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		submission, but this was not accepted.
Grand challenges		
3	The claims for contributions towards SLO2 are less persuasive, and the attempt to link with all of the SDGs is tenuous	Cf. 'must have' #3 about SLO2. While we believe that forests, trees and agroforestry resources can contribute to the achievement of all SDGs (as outlined in the *CIFOR Strategy 2016–2025*), in the FTA full proposal we include only nine SDGs (see Table 2 in Section 1.0.2).
Inter-CRP synergies		
4	…there is limited evidence for a broader agri-food systems approach that demonstrates integration with food production (crop, livestock, and fish)	The narrative of each Flagship and of Tables 1 and 2a provided in *Annex 3.7 – Linkages with other CRPs and site integration* outline the ways in which we considered integration with food production systems, whenever relevant looking at all possible 'options' and providing illustrative examples of actual collaborations. More opportunities for collaboration will likely arise, depending on the actual activities and on progress with the site integration efforts (especially once the site integration plans are completed). We will monitor this carefully in the course of FTA Phase II implementation.
5	The full proposal for Phase 2 of FTA mentions several linkages to other CRPs but the language in Table 1 (i.e. using the future tense) suggests that linking with other CRPs may not have been a priority in development of the CRP research agenda… (3 examples proposed)	Table 1 of *Section 1.0.7 – Cross-CRP collaboration and site integration* uses both present and future tense and was tentatively a summary of the more detailed presentation of the actual and possible inter-CRP synergies provided in Tables 1 and 2a of *Annex 3.7*. As Table 1 is less detailed than those in *Annex 3.7*, we have removed it and have revised the text of *Section 1.0.7*. Interactions of FP1 with the Genetic Gains platform were indeed missing and have been added to *Section 1.0.7* and the FP1 narrative. Further information on the relationship between Flagship 1 and the Genetic Gains platform is given in FP1 Table 3 *(Section 2.1.1).* A particular interface with the African Orphan Crops Consortium is detailed in an endnote to the narrative. There is no direct interaction between FP2 and the Genetic Gain (only indirectly via FP1).
Rigor and credibility of the scientific argument		
6	The introductory section is less well written than the equivalent section of the pre-proposal; it seeks to persuade the reader of the significance of FTA for the SLOs but fails to argue that FTA has identified the scientific questions that must be answered to achieve this. Supporting such claims	The key points presented in the introductory section (*Overview*) of the pre-proposal are now situated in various sections of the full proposal (*Sections 1.0.1; 1.0.2; 1.0.3, 1.0.6*). This might indeed weaken the argument through dilution. With respect to the scientific questions that must be answered, we have responded (or tried to) in the full proposal to the remarks from ISPC on the pre-proposal, and defined three main hypotheses at the program level and specific hypotheses or research questions at the FP and CoA levels. We have also

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	with evidence would strengthen the proposal	conducted various exercises aimed at defining the most important research issues and development questions (e.g. T20Q, worldwide consultation for the CIFOR strategy revision, participated in horizon scanning exercises).
7	It is quite surprising to find little reference to earlier work that has led to the identification of the latest research agenda. /../ this Phase 2 proposal might reasonably have been expected to be based upon the successes of the recent past. /…/ see the acknowledgement of and insights from something that was not a success, which therefore had led to a reconsideration of the research direction.	The issue of refining of the agenda and priority setting is covered by the new Annex 3.18 on priority setting ('must have' #2). Additionally, each FP narrative has a specific section on 'lessons learned and unintended consequences', which explains, where relevant, how the R4D agenda of the specific FP has been influenced by the implementation and findings of FTA Phase 1. Where asked to do so, FPs have strengthened references to previous work. At the CRP level, the lessons learned have been explicated in the extension proposal and in the pre-proposal. There is no specific section actually devoted to this issue in the main narrative. However in its comments on the FTA Phase II pre-proposal, the ISPC notes: "*There is also good evidence that Phase I experience has informed the design of FTA Phase II. For instance, some research activities have been scaled down and others scaled up: FTA has created a new cross-cutting platform on prioritization, impact at scale, and social inclusion (SP1) as well as increased the emphasis on the production side of FT&A. Similarly, there is evidence that recommendations from the IEA evaluation and ISPC extension phase commentary have been acted upon. With respect to the ISPC's commentary, three of six key must-haves have been addressed in their entirety: that is, there is (1) more coherence in the portfolio; (2) clarity on sentinel sites (now under 'observatory landscapes'), even if this can be further elaborated and improved; and, (3) evidence of better linkages with other CRPs. Additionally, FTA has put in place mechanisms to address the three other must-haves: (1) through the ISC, it intends to evaluate its partnership strategy; (2) the ISC review of partnership strategy seems to hold the potential to address questions on comparative and collaborative advantage; and, (3) there is greater attention to political economy of the policy processes via proposed activities in the Supporting Platform*."
8	Some useful work has been published, such as the special issues of World Development, and of Forest Ecology and Management, both of which are commendable and suggest high quality scholarship	Between 2011 and 2015, FTA produced 3,392 publications (1,099 in impact factor (IF) journals of which more than 30% were published in journals with IF>2; 71% open access). FTA publications have been downloaded more than 1.5 million times. In 2014 and 2015 only, we produced 14 special issues in IF journals, making FTA one of the most published CRPs. The list of all FTA publications is available on demand.
9	The proposal could be strengthened by improving the discussion on research on forest governance mechanisms to reflect the need for greater	We are acutely aware of the issue raised in the commentary and of the complexity of governance issues, as we are essentially dealing with 'wicked problems'. One of our overarching hypotheses concerns governance, and each FP's theory of change has well detailed 'output-to-outcome' pathways

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	understanding of the processes, mechanisms, opportunities, constraints, and challenges for improving governance	looking at boundary partners and enabling environments. A great deal of our work is about improving multi-level governance processes (looking a public policy cycles, promotion of enabling environments, market-based instruments, regulations including customary ones, etc.).
Theory of Change and Impact Pathway		
10	… the feedback loops that allow for assumptions being tested, or learning from the research process or changing external circumstances, are largely missing.	We are proposing to set out explicit theories of change at the activity, Flagship and program scales, to have ongoing monitoring for real-time assessment, learning from experience and adaptive management, along with theory-based evaluation to test and improve our theories of change and assumptions (cf. *Annex 3.6 – Results-based management*).
11	… consider risks and assumptions regarding the major cause-effect relationships in the impact pathways from IDOs to impacts.	We are not completely sure of what is being requested here. The FTA IDO-level outcomes in Table 1b of *Section 1.0.3* are mainly sub-sets of the system-level IDOS. In other words, if those FTA IDO-level outcomes are achieved, they can be counted directly as part of the 'mapped IDOs'. The risks and assumptions about how we get there occur earlier in the impact pathways, in the process of generating first-level outcomes, end-of-program outcomes and especially in the translation from end-of-program outcomes to FTA IDOs.
12	FTA targets do not clearly address the larger question of biodiversity conservation at landscape and sub-regional scales, as distinct from global scales	A 'landscape approach' is central to FTA's work frame, and a significant amount of our work occurs at regional or sub-national levels rather than on a global scale. Flagship 4 is fully devoted to this question of sustainable landscapes, and FP3 and FP5 have significant work at subnational levels. Therefore, even if this doesn't transpire via the targets (globally defined in SRF), our consideration of biodiversity conservation – and use – at the landscape scale is addressed in the proposal and is an integral part of our R4D agenda.
Cross-cutting themes		
Gender and Youth		
13	Evidence that some progress has already been made would have been useful as well.	Evidence on progress is already included in the *Annex 3.4 – Gender*, in which we discuss lessons learned and how this knowledge has shaped the direction of gender research in Phase II. However, we have made references to the annex within the narrative more explicit, and mention some of our key outcomes from Phase I (already included in the annex) as evidence of progress.
14	Much greater specificity would also have strengthened the overall impression – for example, by including "what" will be monitored without providing details of "how" arguably suggests a lack	As specified in the full proposal guidance document, we have included a section in *Annex 3.4 – Gender* on how progress towards gender-responsive outcomes will be monitored and evaluated. In order to avoid repeating text from the annex in the narrative, we have only included a reference to the relevant section. As this comment suggests the M&E section is more relevant to the narrative, we have moved it from the annex to the narrative section.

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	of commitment to the gender strategy	We have also revised the overall text to provide more specificity in the research questions and mechanisms proposed.
15	More attention to risks and assumptions in the discussion of the theory of change / impact pathways (p. 20) would be useful	The strict page limit was a major challenge to explaining the proposed theories of change in sufficient detail. However, we have revised the text related to risks and assumptions in an effort to respond to this comment, while keeping the overall text length and clarity.
Capacity Development		
16	It is not completely clear from the document what specific types of individual and institutional capacities are actually needed to do this work	FTA plans to conduct a capacity needs assessment of its strategic research and delivery partners in order to understand what additional individual and institutional capacities would be needed to deliver on the FTA Capacity Development Strategy. However, the findings of the exercise may pose additional budgetary pressure on W1/W2 resources for implementation, as mobilizing bilateral financing for programmatic and management aspects of FTA may not be possible.
Budget		
17	Greater clarity is needed on the budget allocation between FTA and its partners	Specific budget tables by partners were provided as part of the online tool submission. These provide the full details of the budgeting for the core partners. For the other partners, we ask the reviewers to kindly refer to the overall and FP budget narratives.
18	The budget allocated to management is one of the lowest of all CRPs and may not be adequate given that key elements of cross-institutional and cross-flagship coordination seem to be included in the management budget. The CRP may wish to reconsider this allocation.	The cost of management as presented via the online tool concerns only the Management Support Unit and the operating costs of the Management Team. The costs associated with the key cross-cutting activities are in fact provided in the Support Platform on delivering impact and inclusion (*Annex 3.15*) and, for practical reasons, these have also been incorporated into each Flagship budget (as explained in FP budget narratives). We will, of course, happily reconsider assuming additional W1/W2 if it materializes, and we will keep the MSU small and lean.
Leadership and partnership		
19	It would be helpful for the ISPC's assessment of FPs, prior to the SC decision-making process, if the same information [like FP4] could be presented for the other flagships	We have now presented the information about the team credentials for all the FPs in the same format as FP4, showing H factor and citations.
20	Reference is made to key partners throughout the proposal and especially at level of individual FPs, but it is not clear how the science agenda is aligned	The research agenda is co-developed with the main research partners at the CRP and FP levels. At the project level, this is also a central part of the discussion with the partners, but it is constrained by the main science agenda defined at the program level (i.e. we are not engaging in bilateral projects or

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	with those of other external institutions	partnerships that are not fully aligned with the objectives of the CRP, FP, CoA). It should also be noted that a very significant part of our partners are not research institutions and therefore don't have a science agenda.
21	The Theories of Change do not make the value of partners entirely visible	Partnerships are discussed in details in *Annex 3.2,* which explains how partners fit into the various ToCs. Each Flagship also provides a detailed explanation of the role of its specific partners (generic by type of more specific when partners are already identified).
22	On risk management, it is not clear if performance management takes account of science quality.	FTA places a strong emphasis on achieving impact. The program aims to generate new knowledge and to promote and facilitate the use of that knowledge to enable change, solve problems and support innovation. The program design explicitly recognizes that we are working in complex social, environmental and economic contexts that require combinations of new knowledge and innovation, alongside action and engagement. Therefore, FTA research tends to cross disciplinary lines ('interdisciplinary research') and often involves stakeholders and other actors in the research process ('transdisciplinary research'). Managing to achieve high-quality and effective science requires innovative approaches. We conducted a systematic review of the literature (Belcher et al 2016[1]) on defining and measuring science quality in inter- and transdisciplinary research as part of our 'Evidence Based Forestry' initiative. Four main principles emerged: relevance (including social significance and applicability); credibility (including criteria of methodological integration and reflexivity added to traditional criteria of scientific rigor); legitimacy (including criteria of inclusion and fair representation of stakeholder interests); and effectiveness (with criteria that assess actual or potential contributions to problem solving and social change). The review developed a quality assessment framework that can be used by researchers, supervisors, research managers and research evaluators to guide and assess research design and implementation. These principles and criteria are reflected throughout the FTA ToC and program design. To a large extent, this is a new and experimental way of conducting science. Therefore, we have developed a robust 'Design, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system (DMEL)' (described in *Annex 3.6*) to guide and improve the delivery, monitoring and evaluation of high-quality and effective science. Other key components of FTA's science quality strategy include: • Ongoing attention to publishing research in peer-reviewed publications to facilitate and encourage scientific scrutiny and feedback, to help validate FTA work and to promote scientific communication • Increased attention to using additional communication media to more effectively deliver scientific findings to target audiences

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		• Deliberate attention to managing for science quality, including conducting a CCEE on FTA Science quality/research environment to assessing whether and how support and incentives at the individual, team and program levels could be improved • Participating in the ISPC-led working group on Quality of Science, to help ensure that the FTA approach contributes to and is consistent with that of the CGIAR. [1] Belcher BM, Rasmussen KE, Kemshaw MR & Zornes DA. 2016. Defining and assessing research quality in a transdisciplinary context. *Research Evaluation,* 25(1), 1-17. http://rev.oxfordjournals.org/content/25/1/1.full.pdf+html
23	Risks seemed to be treated equally in section 1.15, rather than as high, medium or low,	The risks we present in *Section 1.0.15* are the remaining major risks after analyses (done and revised yearly at center level). As such, all of these risks are 'high', both in terms of likelihoods and impact. They are also largely beyond our control (exemplified by the Brexit, which creates some significant currency exchange risks).
24	it was not clear who is responsible for monitoring of each kind of risk.	The risks are monitored by the MSU with the help of the DDG, Operations of the lead center (CIFOR). The risks are also monitored at the center level as part of their annual risk management exercises.
Flagship 1		
25	The introductory text down to page 12 [to end of section 2.14 on science quality] of the FP1 section is very general and has many unsupported assumptions about the potential benefits of the proposed work on tree genetic resources. The suggestions for potential impacts appear "aspirational" as it is not clear how the figures were derived – this concern recurs throughout the Flagship proposal.	We have rewritten the introductory section to make it more specific and provide a stronger justification for TGR work. This includes additional endnotes with supportive references and an extra table (Table 1 in *Section 2.1.1.1*) that provide a body of supporting information. In particular, please note the extra material that relate to the level of gain that can be expected from domestication activities; the numbers of expected beneficiaries of interventions; and the estimated value of safeguarding, domestication and delivery interventions. In addition, to provide support for the reach of the existing outputs of the Flagship 1 team, we have added an extra figure (Figure 5 in *Section 2.1.1.4*) under the section on 'competitive advantage', which lists online reads and downloads of various atlases, databases, statistical tools and other resources. Such figures do not relate to impacts directly, however they do demonstrate the scale of engagement with other researchers and practitioners, and this supports impacts. To support evidence of future impact, we have also revised the 'lessons learned' section to indicate how current knowledge will support future directions.
26	The text in FP1 is lacking in examples of potentially high impact research. What are the anticipated "breakthroughs", or can the research content be described as incremental improvement?	Example breakthroughs anticipated in clusters of activity are as follows: for safeguarding, in the ability to combine multiple geo-referenced data sets into single decision-support tools through the use of online interfaces; for domestication, in the combination of new and now much cheaper (and therefore newly accessible) genomic methods with decentralized participatory domestication methods to

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		genetically improve tree products; and, for delivery, new understandings of the role of entrepreneurial partners and the use of handheld media devices to support planting material choice. In each case, breakthroughs are supported by new statistical methods and modeling approaches that support decision making. In the case of domestication, a new initiative that will support breakthroughs in the application of genomic methods is the African Orphan Crop Consortium (now described in an endnote). Opportunities for breakthroughs are more clearly expressed in the reworked *Section 2.1.1.4 – Science quality.* While the above represent breakthroughs, it is important to acknowledge that there are important incremental components that cannot always be circumvented by new approaches. For example, domestication activities require time to properly evaluate tree phenotypes, the need for which can only partly be avoided by new breeding methods. For planting material delivery systems, the needed negotiations and policy support to bring about new arrangements among stakeholders to make systems more efficient can also require significant time. In the meantime, important incremental work on sources can result in a general upgrading of planting practice for a wide range of species suited to different option-by-context settings (see Figure 6 in *Section 2.1.1.6).* Lack of recognition of timescales can result in unrealistic expectations of impact. Finally, it is also important to acknowledge that transformative change can come through incremental improvements across multiple areas of activity when these are combined together in an appropriate, coordinated manner. This has been the case with the rural resource center and participatory domestication approach indicated in the narrative. The concept of incremental improvements across areas resulting in significant change underlies the choice of the three CoA of the flagship.
27	Details of species or traits with high potential to deal with disease challenges, climate change or qualities and yields of products for markets are not provided. FTA is likely doing this sort of research but the proposal does not include sufficient information to verify this.	In the revised proposal we provide information on the types of traits that are important in tree domestication and some of the species for which domestication is currently taking place (e.g. see text in *Section 2.1.1.1 – Rationale and scope*, and the legend to Figure 4 in *Section 2.1.1.3*).
28	The proposal does not address the issue of the comparative advantage of FTA in allocating resources for conservation in biodiversity hotspots and protected areas. Thus the FP1 text does not communicate a sharply focused vision of where the greatest payoffs might lie.	Flagship 1 produces a number of safeguarding tools, and these incorporate information on biodiversity (genetic diversity) hotspots and protected area locations. This information is therefore used in setting safeguarding priorities. We now make this point more explicitly in the proposal. Also note that Flagship 1 is concerned specifically with research questions concerning the efficiencies, trade-offs and positive and negative interactions between TGR safeguarding in the context of all three settings of *in, circa* and *ex situ* environments. Clearly, overlays of biodiversity (including genetic diversity) hotspots and

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		protected areas cover all of these settings and are therefore a factor when exploring interactions (e.g. see Figure 4A in *Section 2.1.1.3).*
29	There is emerging activity amongst small and medium enterprises in tree selection, breeding, vegetative propagation and marketing – there is little reference to the way in which FTA activities will relate to the suppliers of these services / materials.	SMEs have important roles to play in these activities in reaching impact, quality and sustainability targets, which have been the subject of significant research. We indicate more clearly the position of involvement of SMEs in the revised Flagship text, although we do not attempt to enter into a detailed discussion of roles. For more information, in the paragraph below we outline some of our current understanding that informs the position of the flagship, based primarily on our recent in press paper of Lillesø et al. 2016 (reference given in endnotes to FP1). Particular reference below is given to planting material delivery systems. Improving agroforestry input supply systems, including planting material delivery systems, through market-led technology adoption requires a sectoral approach seeking to address several bottlenecks simultaneously, based on institutional impediments corresponding to governance issues in value chains. Two major constraints are the identification, establishment, management and commercialization of improved tree seed (and other germplasm) sources; and establishing commercial delivery networks. The first requires involvement by public and private sector actors at different levels depending on the commercial value of a species globally, nationally and locally. Depending on geographic scale and end use, different models for commercial involvement are appropriate, with different pathways for the flow of planting material to growers. Where clonal propagation is merited (e.g. commodity tree crops, some timbers, fruit trees), there may be particular opportunities for SME involvement if technology-level-appropriate propagation methods are made available (rural resource centers mentioned in the body of the text apply such methods). In the second case, a large number of small-scale private commercial tree nurseries in many tropical countries survive despite competition from free tree planting material provided by NGOs, and these constitute an untapped opportunity for building business networks to produce and distribute quality planting material, including for commodity tree crops. Within such networks, the public sector and NGOs have a central role to promote genetic quality as a key concept, so that other actors, including seed and seedling distributors and smallholder growers, are aware of the advantages of utilizing improved planting material. Since quality cannot be visually inspected from the propagule for most tree species, quality assurance must be based on trust and transparency in value chains that incorporate planting material inputs into product market delivery. Once successful information-based demand and supply is functioning, an incentive is created for private business to manage and market improved planting material. Research into the support of SMEs includes considering how best to provide them with the technical and policy support they need to successfully participate in safeguarding, domestication and delivery

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		activities, and how best to integrate them into effective interactions with other relevant stakeholders.
30	Many countries now have advanced capacity in tree tissue culture and some countries are already producing genetically modified trees – how does the FTA agenda relate to all of this?	Working tissue culture protocols that support planting material delivery are now available for a range of tree species, primarily of timber and fruit species, and including several tree commodity crops, some of which species are important to smallholders in the tropics. Protocols are however not often available for many perennial orphan crops. Although developing such protocols is of interest for our wider research program, where it receives some bilateral funding, it is not a priority within the FTA. There are a few approved genetically modified tree species focused on improving growth or conferring pest and disease resistance, including *Eucalyptus* species (eucalypts, Brazil), *Prunus domestica* (plum, USA) and *Populus* species (poplars, China). Research is in addition ongoing on a wider range of species and traits, including modified lignin production, herbicide tolerance, abiotic stress tolerance and developmental traits. The interest of Flagship 1 in tissue culture and GM developments in the context of FTA is primarily in understanding the mechanisms by which biotechnology-related interventions can be made to reach impact through the development of appropriate planting material delivery systems that share costs and benefits equitably. The issue is of particular relevance for AOCC, where laboratory-based interventions support domestication activities that must then reach farmers. In addition to the specific cases where tissue culture methods have importance in supporting the distribution of tree species important for smallholder livelihoods, there are some opportunities for tissue culture in conservation and in supporting biological research of tree species. This is of relevance to our wider program of bilateral funding, where we have some activity, but not to FP1 activities.
31	It is not very clear from the proposal how much tree improvement FTA will actually do and how much it will simply maintain oversight of what others are doing and disseminate advice and recommendations for best practice. Major investments are being made in several countries in improvement of estate crop trees but again it is not clear how FTA work will complement these efforts.	This is an important issue that requires elaboration. We now do so in the revised FP1 narrative, indicating that our research is concerned with providing a limited number of fully worked examples of tree domestication that are models of particular functional uses that can be adopted by others to domesticate further species, based on the contextual variables of specific situations. The flagship, in addition, provides a range of resources, including guidelines, training tools, online global and regional databases and maps, to help develop context-specific solutions for other species and situations. Thus, the theory of change of the flagship relies on the tools and approaches developed for domestication being more widely applied to the domestication of other tree species. Our competency lies particularly in the development of locally-used currently 'underutilized' species, especially using decentralized participatory approaches. These species have often been neglected in past tree improvement programs but have an important role in system diversification. For tree species

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		that are already the subject of significant domestication efforts by public and private breeders (such as various tree commodity crops, timbers and fruits), Flagship 1's role is to 'interrogate' these initiatives for their relevance to smallholders and hence help support these programs by providing important information on smallholder context and priorities. Flagship 1 is, however, concerned with facilitating safeguarding and planting material delivery systems for all tree species of relevance to tropical smallholders. To be clear on this distinction: whereas the flagship is concerned with safeguarding and delivery issues widely, it focuses specific domestication research on lesser-used (not commodity tree crop) species where it has a comparative advantage compared to other programs and where progress can support production system diversification, with a particular concern being food trees and dietary diversification. In the context of safeguarding and delivery research, it is actually very useful to work on a range of tree species placed at different points along a domestication continuum, as this allows trends and transitions to be explored and applied to a broad spectrum of species.
Flagship 2		
32	The Flagship covers a huge range of situations and it would have been good to see more recognition of this diverse potential set of beneficiaries – from small scale oil palm producers through to shifting farmers at the forest margin.	We have added text to *Section 2.2.1.4* to discuss how we address the diverse set of beneficiaries, and make a reference to this from *Section 2.2.1.1*.
33	Having a pragmatic, outcome focused modeller overseeing this part of the portfolio will be critically important. Developing such models is a very time- and scientist-intensive exercise, and it presumably will not be possible to develop them for many locations.	Patricia Masikati oversees field- and farm-level modeling, working with upstream partners CSIRO at field level and Simulistics at farm/livelihood system level, as well as with Tim Pagella at Bangor University to research trade-offs among ecosystems at local landscape scales. We have modified the narrative in *Section 2.2.1.12* to indicate this. Patricia will also work with the ICRAF modeling team in Bogor (Betha Lusiana and Adrian Dwiputra) to develop an in-house capacity to adapt the APSIM modular framework.
34	The novelty of the RinD paradigm (2.2.1) is unconvincing and close examination of Fig. 1 raises more questions. When activities are described as '*Planned comparisons embedded in promotion of options by development partners through communities of practice*' or '*simple to use tools to match options to sites and circumstances across each scaling domain*', it is hard to imagine what	We have modified the narrative on the RinD paradigm when it is first introduced (*Section 2.2.1.1*) to clarify that, while its elements are all individually familiar, it nevertheless represents a new departure to bring them all together in a coherent framework and apply them at large scale to agroforestry, in concert with development partners. The approach was published in *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* (Coe, Sinclair and Barrios, 2014), has been cited 30 times already (Google Scholar), and has attracted substantial funding for its implementation (examples tabulated to clarify this have been added to *Section 2.2.1.6*).

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	outputs will be generated and how they will used. Where will the balance lie between deep and focused science in some locations, and getting broad understanding of multiple situations? In the revision of this flagship project, the proponents should be able to address this issue as a matter of priority. The concept of dealing more with context is sound but there are so many contexts to deal 34with that some priority-setting will be needed. How have the teams considered critically who they expect to use different decision support tools? Have these users been engaged early in the tool development process?	We have now defined all terms at first mention for clarification. Co-learning and communities of practice are now defined in modified text in *Section 2.2.1.2*. Planned comparisons are discussed with references in *Section 2.2.1.4*, examples of simple- to- use tools to match options to sites and circumstances are now given in Section *2.2.1.4*. *Section 2.2.1.2* indicates relative expenditure on deeper focused science (for example, on understanding interactions as opposed to RinD) and the process of prioritizing what research is done where is now described in *Section 2.2.1.6*. We use structured stakeholder engagement to define user requirements for tools and have added a discussion of this with examples to *Section 2.2.1.4*.
35	The five clusters of activity provide very few details on the connections across research. The result is a TOC for this flagship that is weak and appears to be an example of a supply-driven post-hoc rationalisation for a set of activities rather than a demand-driven strategic agenda. The authors have failed to identify where they might have significant transformational impact., …there is no quantification of what has been delivered so far.	The connections across research clusters, including comparative analysis and prioritization amongst clusters facilitated through using common approaches and methods, are provided through CoA 2.1. The text has been modified to clarify this. Figure 2 *(Section 2.2.1.3)* has been modified, to include outcomes in the form they are stated in *Section 2.2.1.2* as well as research outputs on understanding and modeling tree-crop-livestock interactions. Examples of current research and past achievements that evidence the plausibility of all the outcome targets are tabulated in the new *Annex 3.12* and reference made to it in *Section 2.2.12*. We have indicated the scale of RinD funding and the leverage involved, now tabulated in *Section 2.2.1.6*. We have given some examples of quantified impact so far, particularly in *Section 2.2.1.4* with an extended and referenced description of impacts of trees on productivity and income and how this relates to operation of the ToC. We now make it clear in *Section 2.2.1.6* that we operate active portfolio management to focus research on priority issues and geographic areas, and to ensure a sufficient critical mass of activity where we do work to make a difference. Primary priorities are represented by the choice of the four research clusters (2.2–2.5), focusing on key ways in which trees contribute to smallholder livelihoods, based on their potential for impact on SLOs, as set out in the description of each cluster. Within each cluster, specific focal geographies were selected through application of the following criteria: 1) demand from national and regional organizations evidenced by willingness to engage in policy reform and/or significant expenditure on development action (> USD 100 million over the

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
		Phase II duration nationally) 2) potential for impact on SLOs evidenced by the importance of trees to livelihoods and landscapes and prospects for improved management of tree cover, resulting in a focus on forest margins where tree crops are expanding and on agricultural land with >10% cover and locally high population density 3) prospects for site integration by co-locating research amongst partners within the flagship, with other flagships in the CRP (focusing on the FTA sentinel site network) and with other CRPs (where collaborating on key crops: rice, maize, wheat, legumes, dryland cereals and tree-crops).
36	While FP2 overall recognizes the enabling environment for their work, the generally weak state of farmer organizations and of mechanisms to link them with research is not fully explored and is worthy of further consideration, particularly in relation to capacity building strategies.	In *Section 2.2.1.4*, we now discuss structured stakeholder engagement and institutional issues related to various kinds of formal and informal networking in multistakeholder platforms.
37	Big claims for impact must be supported by a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework – the operational aspect of the theory of change. This should be set up to help document progress towards the outcomes. The stated outcomes in Table 1 are not credible because there is no way of verifying them.	We use a combination of process tracing, outcome mapping and evaluation of planned comparisons to effect monitoring and evaluation this provides regular opportunities to reflect. The whole RinD cycle operates iteratively, including ongoing evaluation of lessons learned, followed by reflection and modification (including re-prioritization if appropriate). We have changed the text in *Section 2.2.1.3* to reflect this.
38	The section on science quality (2.2.4) is not adequately clear: for instance, a "co-learning approach" is mentioned, but the proposal does not say what this is. Using 'novel data collection methods', 'recent developments in ICT' (presumably sensor technology) and APSIM-based modelling is fine, but the claim that this will assist in crossing scales remains unsubstantiated	The text in *Section 2.2.1.4* has been substantially modified and expanded to address these points. In *Section 2.2.1.2*, co-learning is now defined at its first use along with what we mean by communities of practice.
39	The research questions in CoA 2.1 do not seem to be grounded in a strategic research agenda	The text in CoA 2.1 has been modified to clarify the role of this cluster in integrating across and prioritizing amongst the other clusters.
Flagship 3		

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
40	There are long lists of other organizations that are active in this field, although it is unclear what their relation to FTA will be.	*Section 2.3.1.7* on partnerships details the list of organizations that constitute main partners of FP3. As the reviewer points out, all those organizations are active around the topics embraced by FP3. We have included Table 5 *(Section 2.3.1.7)* in order to detail the different types of partners engaged in FP3 (i.e. managing partners, contributing partners, scaling partners), and the different roles that these partners will be playing across clusters of activities in order to ensure a successful implementation of the program. The text included in this section also details the specific roles of each of the research partners, knowledge-sharing, and policy and outscaling partners.
41	The text on the research quality makes reference to a number of techniques that will be employed – various sorts of modeling, "political economy" etc. and to the fact that capacity exists in partners to do this work – but the specific role to be adopted by FTA is not clear.	*Section 2.3.1.4* has been improved, particularly with regard to research team niche and qualifications. In order to make explicit the niche of FP3, we have included Table 3, which clarifies the current research gaps are in the different themes embraced by FP3, the methods and approaches that we will draw on, and the new ideas that we will contribute to in the three different fields covered by FP3. The role to be adopted by FTA consists of: 1) acquiring a greater understanding of the spatial and temporal interactions among direct and indirect impacts from disparate public and private policy interventions across multiple scales; 2) gaining additional knowledge on the effectiveness of different public–private 'hybrid' governance approaches for sustainable supply; 3) explaining how different types of business models, contractual, institutional and production arrangements shape outcomes, along with knowledge on their replicability potential, and; 4) understanding the role that finance innovations may have in shaping finance actors' and smallholder behaviors with regard to natural resources use and management. FTA will contribute by catalyzing processes for co-development of knowledge and policy options on these topics in order to trigger policy actions, and through co-learning of implementation processes.
42	It is hard to understand from the proposal exactly what research is to be undertaken. In CoA 3.1, on supply chains, it is not clear how FP3 will answer the research questions listed on page 14.	In *Section 2.3.1.6*, we have revised the questions related to CoA 3.1 focused on 'Enabling sustainable commodity supply chains'. We consider that this CoA is clear in suggesting research focused on examining the effectiveness of public-private initiatives and institutional arrangements for enhancing the governance of value chains leading to greater sustainable commodity supply. This research will emphasize assessments of effectiveness of specific instruments, and comparative analysis across cases and contexts. It will also propose guidelines and tools on the most promising public–private institutional arrangements at different levels for achieving sustainability, along with recommendations on forest management and agricultural production practices (in coordination with FP2) that have greater potential for adoption with improved productivity, thus likely resulting in lower impacts on the environment, particularly through reduced deforestation and forest degradation.

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
43	There is a list of references, but it is not clear how many of these stem from the work of FTA Phase 1 or are even linked to the work of FTA staff or partners.	We have carefully revised the references we provided along the text. In the previous version we prioritized the work from others rather than our own work, in order to show relevance of our program in the context of the broader academic debate. However, given the reviewers' comments, we have systematically backed up several of our assertions with references that stem from our work. The current endnote list include 39 references related to the work of FP3 scientists out of a total of 65 references (1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 64).
	The Theory of Change is largely aligned with IDOs and needs of SDGs, and impact pathways are clear, though based on strong, arguably unrealistic, assumptions about the role that FTA can play in delivering them.	We have tightened the entire section of the impact pathways and theory of change (*Section 2.3.1.3*) to highlight the priority actions that we will conduct in order to achieve our expected outcomes. In addition, we have revised Figure 2 *(Section 2.3.1.3)* to better describe the impact pathways and theory of change. Our outcomes have been criticized for being too ambitious and unrealistic. We have to clarify that in the previous version, we included as the end-of-program outcomes, the outcomes that were formulated for the FTA as a whole, and not for FP3 alone. In order to avoid confusion, in the new version of Figure 2, we have included as the end-of-program outcomes those that correspond to FP3 alone. We hope that the reviewers find that these outcomes have the right level of ambition and realism.
44	There is a strong focus on the roles of smallholders but there some areas where FTA could have considered a broader frame of analysis. How will this work be relevant in complex landscape mosaics outside forest frontiers? What about crop genetics and breeding varieties for intercropping with trees and forests?	We should clarify that a portion of our work relates to landscapes with active forest frontiers, while another portion deals with existing mosaic landscapes with established high-value tree crops (e.g. palm oil, cocoa, coffee, coconut). In this sense, our work on sustainable supply and business models covers those different types of landscapes, and will work closely with FP2 (on production systems of high-value tree crops) in order to improve the potential of systems that can improve the integration of smallholders in global value chains. In addition, we will closely link with FP4 (on improved landscape management) in order to improve options to enhance the balance between expanding commodity supply with greater protection of ecosystems services. With regard to crop genetics, we will not conduct research on the breeding varieties for intercropping with trees and forests as this is work that originates in FP1 and which links directly to the analysis of production systems under FP2. We will draw on this work where relevant for our areas of research. We make explicit these links when describing our impact pathways (*Section 2.3.1.3*) and when looking at the thematic cross-links (*Section 2.3.1.6*). Also, this has been clarified in *Section 1.0.6 – Program structure and flagship projects*.
45	On page 11, the proposal provides an interesting list of lessons learned from previous work but does not give a single reference to publications in which	We have provided several references from our previous work, which back up many of the statements made in *Section 2.3.1.5* about lessons learned and unintended consequences.

#	ISPC comments	FTA response and/or action
	these are documented	
Flagship 5		
46	The CoA 5.2 on adaptation is the least clear of the five clusters, though the overall standard is high. In the commentary on the pre-proposal, the ISPC noted that FTA will need to strengthen the justification for why case studies are the best way to understand adaptation.	Changes have been made to CoA5.2 to increase clarity of the argument, and also to provide a better justification for the need for case studies.
47	Gender issues and activities are clearly defined, though more specifics for work on youth issues may need some further development as the project gets underway.	We have inserted better wording to show how we address youth issues, and will place more emphasis on these aspects as Phase II evolves.
48	Under Cluster 5.2, it would be valuable for FTA to explicitly address different strategies for incorporating bioenergy in landscape mosaics.	We assume this refers to CoA 5.3, bioenergy. We have inserted wording to make clear that bioenergy will be addressed in the context of landscape-level interventions.
49	Under Cluster 5.4, it would be desirable for work on climate monitoring to consider how methods and systems can be integrated into and support more integrated landscape monitoring for assessing multifunctional performance.	CoA 5.4 addresses performance assessment related to the Monitoring Reporting and Verification of achievements in reduced emissions through avoided deforestation and forest degradation. It also looks at assessing relevant policies in more general terms. We have revised CoA 5.4 to address more explicitly the MRV using modern satellite technology (e.g. Biomass satellite etc.). However it would be beyond the scope of what can be covered in FTA to also consider climate monitoring (which must be done at country level). Method and system integration to assess multifunctional performance is the main focus of CoA 5.4, in light of the manifold monitoring needs that countries will face under combined environmental and social goals such as SDGs, INDCS etc.

5.2 Response comments from the Consortium Office on IA and OA/OD

#	Consortium Office comment/request	FTA response and action
Intellectual assets management		
1	The CO requests to revise the paragraph on the outputs of FTA, particularly regarding the identification of CRP outputs in section 1.12 that explicitly excludes "patents, trademarks, plant variety or germplasm", which appears to be an oversight given that CRP outputs are not limited to information products only.	We have revised the concerned paragraph (Section 1.0.12 – Intellectual Asset Management) based on consultation with ICRAF, who is the leader of FP1 and FP2.
2	The CO requests to revise the statement which indicates the limiting approach of LEAs and RUAs as CRP management should have flexibility to modify dissemination pathways as required to achieve impact.	We have revised and added paragraphs on LEAs and RUAs in point 3 (key dissemination pathways for maximizing global impact) of Annex 3.10 on IA management to indicate the possibility of CIFOR and its CGIAR FTA partners entering into LEAs and/or RUAs with partners and private partners, on certain conditions in accordance with CGIAR IA Principles.
3	The CO suggests CIFOR to provide examples of critical/strategies issues and challenges in an FP/CoA specific context, and how they will be addressed, including to address the following: • Identify and explain the IA management approach underlying the dissemination pathways used by the CRP. • Map the aforementioned to specific FPs/CoAs supported by actual/anticipated examples at project level, where available.	We have added a paragraph in point 3 (after the paragraphs on LEA and RUA) of Annex 3.10 in addressing the CO comments by referring to the Impact Pathway and Theory of Change section of the CRP Narrative Proposal as approaches and examples of strategies issues and challenges are more elaborated in that area.
4	The CO suggests identifying and explaining the critical/strategic issues and challenges arising from an IA management perspective which are relevant to the CRP.	We have addressed this suggestion by adding a paragraph to point 3 of Annex 3.10.
5	To consider the following approaches: • development of a CRP-level IP policy framework to guide implementing partners; • information of an IP Management Committee to support the CRP and to coordinate IA management across CRP.	We have addressed this comment by adding a paragraph to point 5 of Annex 3.10.
6	The CO indicates that the responsibility of the Program Management Committee in relation to IA management issues is not explained or	The Program Management Committee refers to the FTA Committee, whereas IA and IP issues are managed by the Team Leader of the Program

#	Consortium Office comment/request	FTA response and action
	distinguished from that of the Lead Center (e.g. role in determining non-standard dissemination pathways that may involve restrictions, particularly those that require justification/reporting); and proposes that the proposal can be strengthened by providing insight into IP legal capacity across the CRP (e.g. by attaching CVs or ToRs for the relevant staff at Lead Center and CRP strategic partners, and indicating anticipated FTE commitments).	Management and Coordination (PMC) unit (IP focal point) and an in-house Legal Officer, neither of whom is a member of the FTA Committee.
Open Access and Open Data management		
7	ToC (Fig. 1), while otherwise good, has a "communication and outreach" area of engagement, but no mention has been made of outputs being openly accessible to inform first-level outcomes through partner and targeted actor engagement. Knowledge-to-outcome and effective research uptake are both indicated, which is good; however, deep engagement with public and private sector actors as envisioned, while helpful, will only go so far without the assurance or explicit assumption that research outputs will be openly available to partners and collaborators.	Key measurements have been added to Table 1 of Annex 3.9. Research outputs will be openly available to ensure effective communication and engagement.
8	To ensure that necessary costs to be budgeted, and appropriately skilled staff to be involved in relevant aspects of the CRP from inception, and throughout the data management life cycle.	Budget and staff allocations have been added to Tables 3 and 4 of Annex 3.9. Professional development /training related to the OA/OD is also allocated to ensure that staff knowledge is updated to support the implementation. Funding will be made available via W1/W2 and bilateral. Staff are actively involved in each step of the project cycle.
9	While there are several relevant and appropriate allusions to the need for standard metadata, there is no mention at all of the existing draft CG Core metadata schema that Centers should be implementing/testing. Further, this section should refer to the OA/OD implementation plans that should have been completed in 2015.	CG Core metadata implementation and Center OA/OD Implementation Plan added to Goal 2 of Table 1, Annex 3.9.
10	More examples are needed to indicate what standards, protocols are being considered. E.g. under Goal 2 of Table 1: "Sharing research data, information, and knowledge" More detail would be useful, in the form of an example or two.	Examples have been added to Goal 2 of Table 1, Annex 3.9.

#	Consortium Office comment/request	FTA response and action
	Further, one of these best practices should be the adoption, testing, and coordinated modification of the CG Core metadata schema.	
11	The FTA team may want to check the following links, which either do not load or appear to have very little CGIAR content: Cartohacho, FSIC, GCS REDD Map.	Databases and links have been removed from the table. FSIC data related to the FTA will be migrated to Dataverse to ensure their availability and accessibility.
12	Access to the project database (https://sharepoint.foreststreesagroforestry.org/#/) requires authentication, i.e., it is not open, although the narrative suggests it is/ought to be. It is stated as being interoperable with other CRPs, but being based on Sharepoint doesn't automatically guarantee this. Can these contents not go into one or more of the other repositories? Sharepoint was never intended to be a repository.	The Sharepoint is not being used as a repository. Centers are using either DSpace, Dataverse or CKAN for their repository. The Sharepoint (https://sharepoint.foreststreesagroforestry.org/#/) is a collaboration space for FTA centers, partners and collaborators. It is used to monitor project deliverables and ensure that outputs are archived.
13	Will the anticipated part-time FTEs prove sufficient to deliver on data quality and OA/OD concerns across the CRP?	The FTE allocation covers all FTA centers. In total, each person/staff actually has 1.0 FTE which divided equally between open access and open data implementation.