

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

Evaluation title: [RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024](https://iaes.cgiar.org/evaluation/science-groups-evaluations), under Science Groups Evaluations <https://iaes.cgiar.org/evaluation/science-groups-evaluations>

Date of MR: 30 September 2024

Overall response to the evaluation: CGIAR thanks the evaluation team for their diligence in conducting this evaluation. In some cases, Recommendations have been partially accepted, with detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Program/ Accelerator leadership.

Person-in-charge for Follow-up to Management Response: CGIAR Chief Scientist; 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action

Recommendation 1 (for CGIAR's work on Resilient Agrifood Systems (RAFS) (for action by RAFS SG and then hand over to Chief Scientist, end of 2024 and beyond): Where founding research has been started by RAFS initiatives (e.g., baselines), this investment needs to be completed so that the results can be capitalized in the new science programs. A systematic review of unfinished experiments should be carried out to advise future plans and consolidate scientific gains.

Management Response	<i>Fully accepted</i> ☐	<i>Partially accepted</i> ☒	<i>Not accepted</i> ☐
Management Response (commentary):	Ongoing work, including founding research, under the current 2022-24 Initiatives has been considered in the development of the 2025-30 Programs and Accelerators and will inform detailed plans for the year-end transition.		

Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership

Management Follow-up

Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation	If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Decisions on what ongoing investments should be completed should ultimately consider a range of factors, including resource availability and prioritization.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 2 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): Better anchor CGIAR work to national research and development agendas. This would require a more meaningful involvement of NARES in the design and implementation of CGIAR Portfolio 2025-30. Developing country level strategies and results frameworks, aligned with national priorities and strong connections with NARES, would strengthen and lay the ground for CGIAR country-level relevance and coordination capacity. The partnership strategy currently being designed (CGIAR, 2024) should specify how CGIAR will ensure an inclusive agenda setting with national and international partners, including by developing a framework strategy for a multi-level consultation and decision-making mechanism with partners. Country level strategies should be informed by this approach and include comprehensive rolling engagement plans to ensure that the national research programs are constantly part of the dialogue.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒	Not accepted ☐
Management Response (commentary):		Building on Listening Sessions and other engagements with partners and stakeholders, the new 2025--30 Programs and Accelerators are being designed to respond to relevant priorities at the local, national, and regional levels.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30, Program/ Accelerator leadership, and functions overseeing CGIAR's country and regional engagement					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The recommendation for an inclusive approach will be considered in the development of CGIAR's upcoming Partnership Strategy. The feasibility and	CGIAR Chief Scientist; 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
prioritization of country-level strategies and results frameworks will need to be reviewed as a function of available resources and the roles and responsibilities of CGIAR's new country and regional engagement functions.	leadership; Country and Regional engagement functions				
Recommendation 3 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): Strengthen the crucial role of country conveners by allocating adequate budget and establishing clear coordination mechanisms and communication lines with CGIAR Regional leadership and Science Programs/Accelerators' coordinators. A single coordination point would enhance and institutionalize cooperation at country level across centers and between partners and will be at the forefront of raising CGIAR's profile in countries.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒	Not accepted ☐
Management Response (commentary):					
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30, Program/ Accelerator leadership, and functions overseeing CGIAR's country and regional engagement					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The recommendation will be considered in the definition of the roles, responsibilities, and resourcing of CGIAR's new country and regional engagement functions.	Country and Regional engagement functions	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 4 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): Operationalize CGIAR's Integration Framework Agreement (2022) through financial and human resources, administrative policies, to streamline and harmonize procedures across centers to avoid unnecessary duplications, administrative burdens and excessive bureaucracy. a) Clarify the role of centers in program and budget management of science programs resources.					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
b) In the absence of a unified human resource platform, enhance CGIAR's cross-coordination abilities to mobilize expertise across centers and regions, based on emerging needs and opportunities, thus demonstrating unified value proposition to national partners.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☒		Partially accepted ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		Recommendation 4: Partially accepted. The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered in the work of the ICI (Integrated, Coordinated, Independent) Forum. (a) Full accepted (b) Partially accepted			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: For Recommendation 4 - with detailed actions to be defined by the ICI (Integrated, Coordinated, Independent) Forum. For (b) with detailed actions to be defined as a function of the ICI process and new organizational structure for people and culture					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
(a) Work is underway to set out the management arrangements for the new Programs and Accelerators, including roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities as well as decision-making processes related to the allocation and use of 'pooled' (CGIAR Trust Fund Windows 1 and 2 resources).	Executive Managing Director (EMD)	2024	Yes ☐	No ☐	
(b) The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered as a function	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30	TBC			

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
of the work of the ICI (Integrated, Coordinated, Independent) Forum; as well as the emerging organizational structure for people and culture.	Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership; People & Culture				
Recommendation 5 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): Operationalize the combination of pooled and bilateral funding by providing specific guidelines to streamline complementarity between the two modalities, with clarifying reporting modalities, both in terms of funding and results. While initiatives have reported only the pooled funded portion of the Portfolio (CGIAR, 2024), it is necessary to undertake a review to identify solutions to this problem and provide improved guidance on integrated planning, implementation and reporting.					
Management Response		<i>Fully accepted</i> ☒		<i>Partially accepted</i> ☐	<i>Not accepted</i> ☐
Management Response (commentary):		The Technical Reporting Arrangement for 2025-30, currently under development by a cross-CGIAR working group in collaboration with Funders, will provide the basis to operationalize a progressive, technical alignment of 'pooled' (CGIAR Trust Fund Windows 1 and 2) and 'non-pooled' (Window 3 and bilateral) funded elements of the Portfolio.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted:					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The above will be underpinned by the emerging management arrangements for the new Portfolio, which set out the roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, and authorities of different management positions and bodies in relation to	Portfolio Performance Unit (PPU), Project Coordination Unit (PCU), Finance	2027	Yes ☐	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
reporting on and alignment of work across different sources and types of funding.					
Recommendation 6 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): Formalize and systematize the PhD student experience and enhance post-graduate researcher contributions to the delivery of the research portfolio based on review. Changing from a three-year to six-year implementation cycle should facilitate the effectiveness and quality of the PhD experience, which is currently variable across centers and SGs. Consistently support Doctoral studies and provide quality control. Conduct an independent review of this important aspect of capacity building with the aim of developing a consistent, system-wide, approach, possibly through a CGIAR Doctoral Training College.					
Management Response		<i>Fully accepted</i> ☐		<i>Partially accepted</i> ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered once relevant Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership structures are in place; and as a function of the ICI process and available resources to harmonize approaches across Centers.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30, Program/ Accelerator leadership, and as a function of the ICI process.					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The recommendation will be considered once relevant Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership structures are in place; and as a function of the ICI process and available resources to harmonize approaches across Centers	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership; People & Culture	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 7 (for CGIAR, overseen by Chief Scientist): As already highlighted in the 2021 Synthesis Review, there is still a need to further broaden the internal skills set to include more social scientists, gender, partnerships and communication experts. Apparently, these					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
have increased during the Portfolio 2022-24 but their presence is not yet adequate for increased efforts towards scaling pathways. It is also important to strengthen internal capacities on topics related to partnerships, policy, and development work through dedicated training.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The recommendation is noted with thanks			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30, Program/ Accelerator leadership.					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The recommendation will be considered once relevant Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership structures are in place; and as a function available resources.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership; People & Culture	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 8 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management): Improve strategic and operational guidance towards cross-center collaboration, interactions between science programs, and between science programs and accelerators. Mechanisms for accountability on cross-center cooperation and cross-programs synergies should be designed and implemented, as well as incentives and rewards for joint work. Intentional planning of synergies is recommended from the design phase, especially by building on commonalities at thematic or geographic levels and through participatory planning exercises with programs coordinators. Once defined, these synergies should be systematically guided and reported.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The recommendation is noted with thanks. The 2025--30 Portfolio of Programs and Accelerators and the associated management arrangements are being designed for coherence and synergies -- across Centers as well as across Programs/ Accelerators.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
Mechanisms and incentives to achieve this will be further defined during the Portfolio transition and inception phase through early-2025, under the leadership of CGIAR's incoming Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership. The level of detail at which synergies can be reported; and joint work explicitly rewarded; will require further review and consideration.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 9 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management): Scaling innovations and managing scaling partnerships should be concentrated in a single scaling program for better coordination. An enhanced decision tool should be developed to help match innovation readiness with resources and scaling partners at country level with a focus on marketable solutions. A deliberate, consistent and coordinated approach across all science programs is needed for this to work. The feedback loops between the Scaling for Impact Program and the rest of the science programs should be clarified and the pathways towards reciprocal engagement should be articulated. The mechanisms on how the achievements of Scaling Program would contribute to impact at national and regional levels should also been made explicit.					
Management Response			Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒
Management Response (commentary):			The recommendation is noted with thanks.		
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30, Program/ Accelerator leadership, and functions overseeing CGIAR's country and regional engagement					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
This is being addressed through a dedicated Scaling for Impact Program, the widespread use of the Innovation Packages and Scaling Readiness (IPSR) protocol, and the emerging country and regional engagement structure overseen by three Continental Convenors. Further details on decision tools, feedback loops, and cross-Portfolio engagement will be developed further during the Portfolio transition and inception phase through early-2025, under the leadership of CGIAR's incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 10 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management): Develop unified guidelines and procedures on performance indicators for staff assessment and quality control mechanisms within Science programs. Since programs involve many centers, performance assessment should be clearly framed and go beyond individual centers systems.					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Management Response		<i>Fully accepted</i> ☐		<i>Partially accepted</i> ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered as the management arrangements for the new 2025--30 Portfolio are operationalized; and as a function of the work of the ICI (Integrated, Coordinated, Independent) Forum; as well as the emerging organizational structure for people and culture. It is noted that the development, roll-out, and operation of fully unified performance assessment across Centers would require considerable, dedicated resources.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined as a function of the ICI process and new organizational structure for people and culture					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The recommendation will be considered as the management arrangements for the new 2025-30 Portfolio are operationalized; and as a function of the work of the ICI (Integrated, Coordinated, Independent) Forum; as well as the emerging organizational structure for people and culture. It is noted that the development, roll-out, and operation of fully unified performance assessment across Centers would require considerable, dedicated resources.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership; People & Culture	TBC	Yes ☒	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Recommendation 11 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management)): Reassess the current expectation of convening and meeting across the science delivery structure to set governance and communication norms from the outset of science program implementation. Establish the frequency of meetings within and between Science Programs. This was quite inadequate during the implementation of the Portfolio 2022-24, with repercussions on ownership to the SG and on the implementation of synergies					
Management Response		<i>Fully accepted</i> ☐		<i>Partially accepted</i> ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The emerging management arrangements for the new, 2025--30 Portfolio of Programs and Accelerators include robust mechanisms for collaboration and coordination across Programs/ Accelerators and Centers.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
Detailed modalities, including the frequency of meetings of the various management bodies proposed, will need to be defined by the incoming CGIAR Chief Scientist and Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 12 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management)): Strengthen the focus on impact areas in the context of medium and long-term processes across and under science programs within a six-year business cycle, to avoid mixing too many topics, while ensuring continuity of research from initiatives (2022-24).					
a) Address the possible isolation of important sub-themes (e.g., food safety, OH, plant health and postharvest) by improved cross-programs coordination and design. Important topics are spread across science programs (e.g., OH, Resilient Cities, Nature Positive Solutions, Plant Health) and need to be coordinated. Appoint thematic champions/leads to support coordination across Science Programs to prevent isolation and the loss of current scientific gains.					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
b) Appoint a single point of thematic leadership for issues of strategic importance to Improve coordination thematically across science programs, e.g., FLW or postharvest losses. The challenges and questions related to the theme of the deep dive on Food, Feed, and Waste were fragmented across the design of several Initiatives. This suggests that, in future re-designs of the thematic research of CGIAR, a stage of cross-assessment of research questions should be included to ensure consistency and reduce the possibility of duplication. c) Where initiatives show early promise, e.g., the OHI, it is important to protect these gains when designing science programs and to encourage more widespread adoption of the approach. d) Target processes while not being excessively guided by an 'ideal' number of programs and their 'form' and be realistic on expectations; avoid an excessive number of outputs and deliverables to be achieved in short timeframes. e) During planning, consider that research needs adequate time to produce results. In this respect, CGIAR should promote donors' and external partners' awareness to allow science quality to determine the pace of the programs. In this respect, MELIA mid-term reviews should support evidence-based targeting and steering.					
Management Response		<i>Fully accepted</i> ☒		<i>Partially accepted</i> ☒	
Management Response (commentary):		The new, 2025--30 Portfolio of Programs and Accelerators is being explicitly designed to deliver against the five Impact Areas of CGIAR's 2030 Research and Innovation Strategy. The detailed modalities for performance and results management and technical reporting are being developed with this in mind. Proposals will be screened against Impact Area relevance (0-1-2) and per-result tagging will track delivery per Impact Area. The Results Dashboard and Technical Reports will provide an Impact-Area view of contributions.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership. (d) and (e) are fully accepted.					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
(a)The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered in the continued development of the relevant Programs/	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
Accelerators. The recommendation to appoint thematic champions/ leads will be considered on a case-by-case basis against the need to maintain clear, coherent, and simple management arrangements for the new Portfolio and its Programs and Accelerators.	Accelerator leadership				
(b)The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered in the continued development of the relevant Programs/ Accelerators. The recommendation to thematic leads will be considered on a case-by-case basis against the need to maintain clear, coherent, and simple management arrangements for the new Portfolio and its Programs and Accelerators.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025-30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
(c)The recommendation is noted with thanks, and will be considered in the continued development of the relevant Programs/ Accelerators.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
(d)The recommendation is accepted and will be considered in the continued development of the relevant Programs/ Accelerators.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
(e) The recommendation is accepted and will be considered in the continued development of the relevant Programs/ Accelerators; as well as the associated performance and results management arrangements.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio/ Program/ Accelerator leadership; Portfolio Performance Unit (PPU)	2027	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 13 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management)): The chief scientist should be responsible for measurable improvement in QoS and alignment to QoR4D across all science programs. An action plan to implement this should be developed and implemented within a year. This plan should aim to generate the highest quality of scientific outputs and innovations in the next planning cycle. A focus on improving quality and encouraging greater engagement in QoS improvements from NARES partners should form part of this plan to promote improving legitimacy over time.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☐		Partially accepted ☒	Not accepted ☐
Management Response (commentary):		The recommendation is noted with thanks			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted: Detailed actions to be defined by incoming Chief Scientist working alongside relevant Portfolio leadership					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation	If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
The recommendation will be considered in the further development and operationalization of the management arrangements for the 2025-30 Portfolio. While the detailed terms of reference of the CGIAR Chief Scientist and cross-Center Global Science Team will be developed in further detail, it should be noted that Centers retain ultimate responsibility for the QoS of their W3/ bilaterally funded projects and programs.	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio leadership	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Recommendation 14 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management)): Science programs should systematically design and implement M&E frameworks and plans, including development of baselines, for real time monitoring to support result-based timely decisions. M&E frameworks, plans should be constantly updated with cumulative values achieved for output and outcome indicators.					
Management Response		Fully accepted ☒		Partially accepted ☐	Not accepted ☐
Management Response (commentary):		The Evaluability Assessment Framework will inform MELIA planning in 2025.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted:					
Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
The Technical Reporting Arrangement for 2025-30, currently under	Portfolio Performance Unit (PPU),	2025	Yes ☐	No ☐	

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action					
development by a cross-CGIAR working group in collaboration with Funders, provides for the development of detailed MELIA plans, which will be established during the inception phase (by early-2025) informed by the Evaluability Assessment framework.	Project Coordination Unit (PCU)				
Recommendation 15 (for portfolio 2025-30/science programs (for Science Program proposal authors/program management): Align the work on gender, equity and social inclusion, recognized as accelerators in the 2025-30 Portfolio, with the Gender Strategy being developed by the Gender Platform (CGIAR, 2023). While related conceptual frameworks, action plans and M&E systems should be designed at system level, also including issues related to youth and social inclusion of marginalized groups, the Gender Accelerator should translate them into actions within science programs: a) Ensure that gender-responsive and gender-transformative research continue underpinning Science Programs through the designated accelerator and that these cross-cutting themes (accelerators) are not dropped by future budget cuts; b) Building on the above-mentioned strategy document and frameworks, science programs should develop their own position papers explaining how they contribute to gender and social inclusion endeavors and on how gender empowerment and equity support advancements towards programs' outcomes. They should also develop action plans and M&E systems supporting implementation and accountability to stated gender objectives; c) Internal and partners' capacities on gender, social inclusion and intersectional analysis should be enhanced (see Rec.7) and the engagement with partners working on gender should be expanded; d) Social inclusion of marginalized groups and inclusion of youth should be clearly stated and accompanied by definitions and standard indicators to support operationalization.					
Management Response		Fully accepted☒		Partially accepted☒	
Management Response (commentary):		a – Partially accepted. Requires clarification, the bulk of CGIAR gender work is delivered through the Science Programs, and the Accelerator is there to support. b, c & d are fully accepted.			
Brief explanatory statement if recommendation is rejected or partially accepted:					

RAFS Science Group Evaluation 2024: Management Response

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS: grouped temporally for individual SG as evaluand (short term), and for CGIAR Science Program teams and CGIAR management (mid to long term), to facilitate uptake and action

Management Follow-up					
Actions to be implemented	Responsible	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation		If further funding required – how much and what is to be done if no funds available?
b) Development of Programmatic position papers and action plans on gender	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio leadership, GESI Accelerator	2025	Yes ☐	No ☐	
c) Internal capacity needs to be strengthened through a competency assessment	CGIAR Chief Scientist and 2025--30 Portfolio leadership, GESI Accelerator, P&C	TBC	Yes ☐	No ☐	
e) Define social inclusion and youth definitions and indicators	GESI, PPU, PCU	2025	Yes ☐	No ☐	