

Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

Inception report

June 2025

Contacts:

Lulseged Desta, Interim Program Coordinator (lt.desta@cgiar.org)

Jörn Schmidt, Deputy Interim Program Coordinator (j.schmidt@cgiar.org)

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
Executive summary.....	5
1. Program/ Accelerator overview.....	6
1.1 High-level Vision	6
1.2 Achievements from 2022—2024.....	6
1.3 Description of intended research.....	7
2. Codesign and partnerships	11
3. Theory of change and MELIA.....	13
3.1 Theory of change	13
3.2 Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, and Impact Assessment (MELIA).....	15
4. Comparative advantage analysis.....	17
5. Prioritization	18
5.1 Knowledge-driven priorities.....	18
5.2 Final decisions on the Program/Accelerator’s direction and design.....	19
6. Alignment of W3 and bilaterally funded work.....	21
7. Plan of Results and Budget.....	22
8. Cross-Portfolio linkages and geographic coordination.....	23
8.1. Cross-portfolio linkages.....	23
8.2 Geographic coordination	23
10. Risk Management	24
11. Addressing feedback on select topics	26

Acronyms

AoW – Area of Work
AI – Artificial Intelligence
B-REAL – Specific project under MFL SP
CA – Comparative Advantage
CBD COP – Convention on Biological Diversity Conference of Parties
CIFOR-ICRAF – Center for International Forestry Research – World Agroforestry
CIRAD – French Agricultural Research Center for International Development
COP – Conference of Parties
CRS – Catholic Relief Services
CSOs – Civil Society Organizations
DyTAES – Dynamic Territorial Agroecology System (Senegal network)
ECOWAS – Economic Community of West African States
EHBIAP – Environmental Health and Biodiversity Impact Assessment Program
FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization
FTE – Full-Time Equivalent
GAC – Global Agri-Food Coalition
GEF – Global Environment Facility
GEYSI – Gender, Equity, Youth, and Social Inclusion
GGW – Great Green Wall
GIS – Geographic Information Systems
GLF – Global Landscapes Forum
HLO – High-Level Output
IA – Impact Assessment
ICRISAT – International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFPRI – International Food Policy Research Institute
ILC – International Land Coalition
ILRI – International Livestock Research Institute
IPBES – Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature
LAC – Latin America and the Caribbean
LDN – Land Degradation Neutrality
MCDM – Multi-Criteria Decision-Making
MELIA – Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, Impact Assessment
MFL SP – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program
NBSAPs – National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
NDCs – Nationally Determined Contributions
NGOs – Non-Governmental Organizations
NL – The Netherlands
OP – Operational Plan
PMU – Program Management Unit
PORB – Plan of Results and Budget
QED – Quantum Engineering and Design
RRI – Rights and Resources Initiative
SADC – Southern African Development Community
SA – South Asia
SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals
SEA – Southeast Asia and the Pacific
TCA – True Cost Accounting
TNC – The Nature Conservancy
ToC – Theory of Change
TPP – Transformative Partnership Platform
UNCCD – United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCBD – United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNEP – United Nations Environment Program
WCA – West and Central Africa

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

WOCAT – World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies

WRI – World Resources Institute

WUR – Wageningen University & Research

Executive summary

This report summarizes advances achieved during the inception phase of the 2025-2030 Portfolio Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program (MFL SP), based on a series of collaborative activities:

1. Comparative Advantage, and Prioritization Exercises; Mapping of Bilateral Projects
2. Revisit and revision of Theory of Change (ToC), assumptions, High-Level Outputs (HLOs), indicators, targets, outcomes, Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, Impact Assessment (MELIA)
3. Interactions with strategic partners
4. Iterative discussions with CGIAR Science Programs and Accelerators
5. Regular virtual meetings with the Transition Team and then with the Leadership Team of participating Centers: Alliance Bioversity-CIAT, CIMMYT, CIP, ICARDA, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IITA, ILRI, IWMI, WorldFish, and CIRAD (MELIA-PMU focal point) and CIFOR-ICRAF (AoW 6 lead)
6. Bi-weekly Area of Work (AoW)-specific meetings
7. A Program-specific geographic prioritization exercise
8. The nomination of country coordinators for the Program implementation in MFL SP sites
9. Virtual workshops, one for each AoW, on activity plans, and elements of this report
10. The preparation and delivery of the [Program presentation at CGIAR Science Week](#)
11. A three-day Program workshop
12. Participation in events and conferences discussing the Program with stakeholders.

These activities provided a shared understanding of the Initiative portfolio achievements and how they underpin intended outcomes. The 2025 work plan could be developed and a shared Program vision for 2030 refined. Engagements also fostered a common understanding of Program coordination and identified opportunities for linkage and collaboration across AoWs. Each AoW's [theories of change](#) outputs, indicators, and targets have undergone significant review and refinement.

Throughout its development and early implementation phases, the Program has actively engaged a wide range of **partners**. Key collaborators CIRAD and CIFOR-ICRAF have supported Program conceptualization and now lead various thematic and country coordination roles. Ongoing consultations with donors and partners have enhanced technical design and established strategic collaboration frameworks. The Program has also built momentum through engagements with global platforms, international organizations and technical partners.

The **comparative advantage** analysis shows that CGIAR is well-positioned to lead across the ten aggregated High-Level Outputs (HLOs) of the MFL SP, while also identifying areas where collaboration with global and regional partners is essential, and where partners have comparative advantage to lead on specific inputs. The analysis will be continued at each Landscape to identify local and national partners.

The **knowledge-driven prioritization** process indicates that the MFL SP has the greatest potential for impact through its HLOs in the areas of environmental health and biodiversity, and climate adaptation and mitigation. It also delivers poverty reduction and food security targets in selected regions (e.g., Eastern and Southern Africa and Western and Central Africa). As the implementation of this Program is grounded in the recognition that landscapes exist at different stages of development, they require different configurations of HLOs to deliver impacts for both people and nature.

The analysis of **alignment of W3 and bilaterally funded work** shows 12 projects with high complementarity of results. A few potential gaps that the MFL SP aims to address and could be targeted through further fundraising are related to nutrition-specific outcomes, scalable financing models, systemic policy coherence, and digital tools for monitoring.

The two examples of **cross-portfolio linkages** highlighted in this report are Sustainable Farming, with emphasis on 1) sustainable water development and use, and 2) land-sparing and land-sharing strategies; and Climate Action, related to co-location of research within MFL SP sites using the living lab approach, an approach discussed in this report as a geographical coordination mechanism. However, thematic linkages exist with all other Programs and Accelerators and will engage in specific activities with them.

1. Program/ Accelerator overview

1.1 High-level Vision

In response to the global challenges of land degradation, climate change, biodiversity loss, water scarcity, and food insecurity, the Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program (MFL SP) applies a systems-based approach that builds on an understanding of landscapes as complex and interlinked social-ecological systems—guided by a “source to sea” perspective to drive integrated solutions that reconcile production, conservation, and restoration objectives.

The MFL SP envisions thriving, biodiverse, low-emissions, and healthy landscapes that are managed holistically to deliver resilient and equitable livelihoods, biodiversity and ecosystem gains, and the production and consumption of healthy, nutritious food, while staying within planetary boundaries. In this vision, landscapes are stewarded by diverse stakeholders who co-design inclusive technological, socioecological, and institutional innovations, engage in policy processes, and are supported by inclusive governance and effective planning. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC), women, youth, and socially currently marginalized groups are integral participants, and beneficiaries.

This vision is operationalized by bringing together the collective strengths of key CGIAR Initiatives including Agroecology, Nature-Positive Solutions, Livestock and Climate, and the Environmental Health and Biodiversity Impact Area Platform (EHBIAP) as well as related bilateral projects. These efforts converge into a global science platform for action, grounded in systems thinking and landscape approaches, to address complex sustainability challenges across sectors and regions.

A defining feature of this vision is its deliberate focus on reconciling and balancing production, restoration, and conservation objectives simultaneously across scales, spanning from “farm to fork” and “net to plate.” Through a shared landscape vision, the platform enables coordinated, Evidence-based action toward multifunctional, resilient, and inclusive agri-food and aquatic systems.

In our vision, the [agroecology principles](#) including nature-positive, regenerative and other complementary solutions will guide the achievement of socio-ecological gains. The Program is committed to transdisciplinary research co-implemented with stakeholders and partners using the Living Labs approach (see section 8.2). It pays attention to mixed systems including agroforestry, biodiversity and water systems as recommended in the [21st meeting of the CGIAR System Council](#) (page 3).

1.2 Achievements from 2022—2024

Across multiple levels, from individual farms to national and global policies, a set of transformative initiatives have been advancing transitions toward reconciled production, restoration, and conservation objectives.

Farm systems (with achievements underpinning particularly outcome 1 and 2 of the Program): Over 100,000 farmers have benefited from participatory, farmer-led approaches participating in the [Nature Positive Initiative](#) and adopting crop, soil, water and waste related technologies. This resulted in increased levels of (agro)biodiversity, access to [adapted seeds](#) and crops. An evaluation by the [Agroecology Initiative](#) covering 30 practices in eight countries with more than 5,500 farmers showed evidence of [improving yields, biodiversity, and resource efficiency](#). Agroecology also developed and tested a [performance assessment framework](#) for evidence generation with results in 8 countries, based on 2,000 household surveys. **At the landscape level**, the [My Farm Trees](#) digital platform, featured in the CGIAR [Flagship Report](#) successfully achieved farmer- and community-led tree-based restoration of degraded landscapes with over 6000 smallholder farmer, and more than 200,000 trees growing in Kenya, Viet Nam, and India. The [Livestock and Climate Initiative](#) has been promoting participatory rangeland management across 2.3 million hectares, including conservation zones.

Market systems (with achievements underpinning particularly outcome 3 of the Program): Nature Positive supported circular [bioeconomy solutions](#) like biogas and insect-based feed where over 11,000 farmers benefited from training on circular bio-economy methods. Agroecology (and Nature Positive with 17 SMEs) worked with private companies and farmers associations in eight countries

to co-design and strengthen agroecological business models. A [value chain analyses](#) showed positive impacts on more than 3.200 families. Ten small, local enterprises in six countries received financial and technical support through incubation and acceleration pilot programs leading to the development of projects valued at up to USD 1.2 million each. Livestock and Climate has influenced [\\$405 million in pastoral investments](#).

Policy environment, with achievements underpinning particularly outcome 5: In Kenya, Nature Positive has shaped biodiversity-friendly policies in [Vihiga County](#), and changes in [seed policies](#); a [national agroecology strategy](#) has been approved with the support from Agroecology and Nature Positive. Nature Positive supported policy strategies in Viet Nam ([food system transformation](#)) and Burkina Faso ([neglected species](#)). Agroecology strengthened policies and institutional coordination in Kenya, Lao PDR, Peru, Senegal, Tunisia. Livestock and Climate drove [land-use planning and governance reforms](#), particularly across East Africa and Tunisia. The True Cost Accounting (TCA) analysis for food production in [Kenya and Viet Nam](#) triggered tremendous interest through regional and international dialogues with more targeted policy and community engagement planned for 2025. [EHBIAP](#) enhanced CGIAR’s role in global policy forums, aligning environmental assessments with Rio Conventions and SDGs, and contributing environmental indicators that guide sustainable business decisions and fosters knowledge-sharing via digital tools.

Cross-cutting achievements: Through the establishment of [11 Agroecological Living Landscapes in eight countries and an international network](#), the agroecology Initiative implemented [principle-driven participatory action research](#) at farm, market and policy levels and promoted agroecological transitions. Participatory, socially inclusive attention to [political economy](#) and [local governance](#), and context-specific solution development processes have driven the three initiatives and the platform, increasing the participation of marginalized groups. The Agroecology Initiative implemented [behavioral change strategies](#) for long-term impact in Burkina Faso, India, Kenya, Lao PDR, Tunisia, and Zimbabwe.

1.3 Description of intended research

The MFL SP’s **unique value proposition** is to be the flagship natural resource-based Program of CGIAR. The Program shapes food, nutrition, and environmental outcomes by applying a landscape-based lens, spanning plot, farm, community, and biome, to understand material flows, ecological interactions, and human behaviors. MFL SP takes a holistic, system-level approach by aligning sustainable food production and consumption with ecosystem restoration and biodiversity conservation. It aims to raise self-sufficiency within landscapes to meaningful levels, ensuring that landscape actors, including farmers, fishers, researchers, land managers, entrepreneurs, and policymakers, are not forced to choose between productivity, nutritional, and environmental integrity goals. To this end, we work in selected MFL sites using the living labs approach (see section 8.2) to co-develop science, data, tools, provide near real-time evidence and strengthen capacities to manage trade-offs and enhance synergies across the agrifood system. The Systems perspective enables integrated agroecological transitions that generate long-term environmental, social, and economic impacts. The MFL SP is uniquely positioned to advance global biodiversity targets and ecosystem health *in equal measure* with objectives related to nutrition and food security, poverty reduction, livelihoods, climate resilience and mitigation, and social inclusion—ensuring that all goals are pursued holistically and making trade-offs explicit.

To achieve the Program’s outcomes of resilient and equitable livelihoods, biodiversity and ecosystem gains and healthy and nutritious food production and consumption, the MFL SP engages in the following technical research approaches and methods.

Program Outcome 2030 OC-1: 2030 OC-1. Farmers, fishers, herders, foresters, forest and water user groups, national and sub-national public actors, and private sector actors in the targeted landscapes apply technological, socio-ecological, policy and/or institutional innovations that enhance food production, ecosystem restoration and gains, biodiversity conservation and protection, social cohesion and resilience, and healthy diets in thriving Multifunctional Landscapes (**AoW1**). **To achieve this outcome**, the Program integrates science-based experimentation with local knowledge and co-creates “bundles” of solutions suited to specific contexts to optimize sustainable use and stewardship of agricultural landscapes, terrestrial and aquatic agroecosystems and their agrobiodiversity, forests, rangelands, water bodies, peatlands, and

native genetic resources. **Research approaches** focus on agroecological, restorative, regenerative, and climate-resilient management of farms and landscapes. The Program uses actor-centered advisory and training to anchor and scale solutions. Innovative **research methods** will be applied across different nested scales. Soil, water and (agro)biodiversity solutions will be applied on farm and at plot levels in an integrated manner. This will include genetic approaches for the deployment of (agro)biodiversity to ensure adaptation to climate change and to monitor changes in soil biodiversity, focusing on neglected and underutilized species and more adapted varieties for major crops. This work will also aim at better understanding the feedback between below and above ground biodiversity. In addition, plots and farms will be managed in an organized manner, e.g. through cooperatives, for better integration with markets. At the landscape level, depending on the priorities, different tools and methods will be used for restoration of degraded land, watershed management to reduce erosion (including through bio-physical structure). Selection of crops and species to be used in farm and landscape levels will be based on their nutritional profile. The Program promotes sustainable feed and fodder systems that integrate local forages, crop residues, and restored grazing areas. Finally, specific tools and methods such as 24-hour dietary recalls will be used to change consumer behaviors and ensure improvement of diets by specifically targeting consumer for greater awareness on the importance of better diets. eDNA will be used to monitor biodiversity changes in the landscapes, e.g. from spider webs and by collecting soil samples. Near real-time monitoring system (**AoW 6**) will be used to assess changes and progress.– **Required expertise** include plant and conservation genetics, physiology, crop and soil science, animal science, agronomy, breeding, landscape ecology, as well as modelling expertise related to advance recent developments in AI.

Program Outcome 2030 OC-2: 2030 OC-2. National and sub-national public actors, farmers, herders and fishers, local communities, private sector, NGOs and CSOs actively implement inclusive land and water resources use planning and landscape governance (investment plans, multistakeholder platforms, etc.) to optimize landscape multi-functionality (**AoW 2**). **To achieve this outcome**, the Program is working to develop land use and management plans that reduce land use conflicts and enhance synergies. It works with landscape multi-stakeholders to develop a vision for optimizing multifunctionality (production, restoration, conservation) in their landscape, Research is undertaken on how this vision can be operationalized with bundles of solutions drawing from AoW1 and other options. Geospatial analyses and integrated modelling techniques are used to co-identify priority areas for investment followed by socio-economic and ecological characterization. Analysis of human geography and demographic trends, spatially explicit modelling, scenario analysis, cost-benefit and trade-off analyses, serious game approaches are used to optimize appropriate land use and management options for the priority areas and/or other landscapes under consideration enhancing synergies between statutory and customary land tenure systems. Digital landscape twins are integral part of the work. An appropriate governance system (likely polycentric) is being co-developed and actioned. **Research approaches** begin with tools for analyzing landscape context and stakeholders, building on those developed under the Initiatives—such as multistakeholder mapping, spatially explicit threat analysis, and analysis of power dynamics. This guides co-development of a shared vision to optimize landscape multifunctionality, including the analysis of available research findings with the Program partners and landscape stakeholders. GEYSI and power dynamics are integrated throughout, with efforts to address inequities in both research and interventions (**AoW 5**). **Required expertise** include landscape ecology and environmental science, political ecology, geographic information systems (GIS), landscape modelling and remote sensing, organizational and collective action, social sciences (including human centered design), human geography and GEYSI.

Program Outcome 2030 OC-3: 2030 OC-3 National and sub-national public actors, market and finance sector actors design and implement coordinated, inclusive and coherent policy, institutional, organizational, market and non-market innovations that support the transition to thriving Multifunctional Landscapes (**AoW 3 and AoW 4**). To achieve this outcome, the **research approaches** focus on the co-creation of knowledge on markets and consumer preferences together with innovative inclusive business models (deploying decision support tools and protocols) and financial mechanisms, such as green business opportunities. Bioeconomy, payments for ecosystem services and circular economy are implemented to support the MFL transition process. Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) methods, market-driven financial projections, agroforestry

cash flow projections (leveraging market intelligence) are employed to achieve outcomes. The work is underpinned by enabling policies, strategies, and institutional arrangements that are key for effective and inclusive public and private MFL investments (**AoW 4**). It includes analytical frameworks for policy alignment across sectors, ex-ante and/or ex-post impact assessment of alternative policy or investment options, political economy of key MFL processes, desired institutional changes and coordination for MFL: Power balance & mapping, exploring stakeholder endogenous preferences and behavioral attributes for institutional change pathways. **Required expertise** relates to market systems and value chain development, consumer behavior, circular and environmental economy and finance and investment. On the policy side, it requires expertise in political economy, new institutional economics, multi-level adaptive and polycentric governance, and analytical frameworks for policy coherence.

Program Outcome 2030 OC-4: 2030 OC-4. Marginalized people in each Multifunctional Landscape participate in the implementation of the plans, governance, organizational or institutional innovations, and business models, benefiting from the restoration and conservation of landscapes and transformation of eco-agri-food systems (**AoW 5**). **To achieve this outcome**, the Program enhances fairness and gender equality and social inclusion (GEYSI) supporting capacity sharing and knowledge integration, and informing strategies and interventions aimed to address the root causes of inequality between women and men together with other forms of discrimination in resource access, decision-making, and agency, as well as the structural barriers and lack of opportunities for Youth that pose significant obstacles to fair and equitable rural development.

Research approaches require collaboration across AoWs to mainstream gender-responsive research and social inclusion (“Do no harm – “leave no one behind”). GEYSI approaches and methods are adapted to a landscape perspective to include emerging topics like resilience, quality of life, or social movements to understand and build the evidence base on the social incentives for people and organizations to transition to equitable and sustainable MFL and invest in their management. Innovative methods include targeted gender-responsive and transformative research methods at organizational and landscape scales, polyvocal spaces and community dialogues; qualitative and quantitative formative social science research, responsible scaling ([GenderUp](#)), and agency and behavioral change approaches to system change ([ACT framework](#)) that are co-developed with stakeholders. **Required expertise** include digital and technological literacy, participatory and indigenous knowledge systems Youth transformative approaches transdisciplinary and socially inclusive participatory research.

Program Outcome 2030 OC-5: 2030 OC-5 National, regional, and global actors use scientifically-sound evidence and capacities on the benefits of thriving Multifunctional Landscapes to engage in global and regional agenda settings and policy discourse (**AoW 6 and AoW 7**). **To achieve this outcome**, the Program generates and strategically frames actionable evidence to underline the importance of funding nature-based research and development, highlighting where most economic benefits originate and why sustained investment in these areas is critical. The Program also demonstrates the economic costs of inaction to de-risk investments and build private sector confidence. This will inform policy coherence and institutional empowerment pathways and guide the integration of MFL science into national, regional, and international policy frameworks including SDGs, NBSAPs, NDCs, LDN, [GGW](#), [AFR100](#) targets, and agrifood transformation plans. (**AoW 7**) The unique positioning of MFL-SP offers CGIAR a strong value proposition to establish formal partnerships with global environmental agencies. Engagement are being strengthened and alignments sought with initiatives such as IPBES, UNCCD, UNCBD (drawing on their recent reports), the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, G20 Global Land Initiative, and regional bodies like IGAD, ECOWAS, SADC, African Union Commission, the Kampala CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026–2035) or ALLiSEA. **Research approaches** focus on needs-based capacity sharing, and knowledge management for a shared vision related to environmental health, biodiversity, and ecosystem services and on strategic engagement with science-policy interfaces of global conventions and financing mechanisms. This includes real-time learning dashboards, facilitation of Communities of Practice and Learning Networks, the compilation of evidence and capacity sharing to support policy advocacy, and the development of impact indicator assessment frameworks to effectively engage with the global policy arena on global and regional agenda settings and policy discourse. impact indicator assessment frameworks to effectively engage with the global policy arena on global and regional agenda settings and policy discourse.

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

Evidence generation addresses methodology and data gaps for linking farm-level and landscape-level measures across a wide range of metrics. It leverages citizen science and artificial intelligence (AI) for data collection, management, and analysis. Integrative/whole farm/landscape dynamic modelling and foresight techniques address the lack of evidence on the production approaches to be tested. The Program includes digital twin landscapes, designed through ex post and foresight modelling approaches in combination with AI. **Required expertise** includes political science, environmental economics, multi-level governance and policy coherence, strategic framing and policy narratives, global policy regimes, strategic communication, dashboard design, and explorative AI.

2. Codesign and partnerships

During the Program design and inception phases, different mechanisms were employed to engage partners and stakeholders, significantly influencing the Program’s design and drawing from the three Initiatives, EHBIAP and multiple bilateral projects coordinated by various Centers.

Following the CGIAR’s Engagement Framework’s approach to ‘partner segmentation’, the Program engages with demand partners who receive scientific and technical support (i.e. farmers associations and small businesses), innovation partners who co-invest and collaborate to develop tailored innovative solutions and improve innovation readiness (universities, research centers, NGO and private sector organizations) and scaling partners collaborating to advance uptake and use of innovations at scale (networks, associations and national governmental institutions). Some of the engagement mechanisms that the MFL SP has used in this process are:

Consultation and collaboration. Partners were engaged through listening sessions, bilateral interactions, and Program meetings to ensure diverse perspectives are integrated into the Program design and inception (see example of [Agroecology](#)).

The Program will be collaborating closely with the Transformative Partnership Platform ([TPP](#)). The collaboration provides the MFL SP with opportunities to engage with initiatives beyond the CGIAR, facilitating the exchange of lessons, knowledge, and cooperation to address remaining knowledge and action gaps in large-scale agroecological transitions. The TPP plays a significant role in supporting engagement, outreach, and experience sharing. MFL SP will work closely with [1000 Landscapes](#) (EcoAgriculture Partners) to best connect global landscape partnerships, data, and platforms that support research, policy, and scaling of landscape approaches.

Many other partners that are collaborating with the Initiatives continue as allies of the Program, as for example the [World Resources Institute](#), [Commonland](#), [The Nature Conservancy](#), [Agroecology Coalition](#), [OpenGeoHub](#), etc. Some of them have shown their keen interest and support through their commentaries during the [CGIAR Science Week](#). CGIAR collaboration with the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies ([WOCAT](#)) will enable fostering collaborations in co-identifying locations and needs of action, sharing knowledge in land management, co-identifying appropriate sustainable land management (SLM) technologies, and supporting on the ground implementation and upscaling proven best practices.

During the second semester of 2025, the MFL will host workshops with partners and stakeholders **at the sites where engagement-implementation is taking place in 2025**, and where the Initiatives have been working:

1. Colombia (Nariño)	7. Kenya (Lower Eastern integrated landscape and Lake Victoria Bassin)
2. Peru (Ucayali)	8. India (Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra / Solapur)
3. Tunisia (El Kef)	9. Viet Nam (Cambodia-Laos-Viet Nam corridor)
4. Senegal (Fatick)	
5. Tanzania (Kiteto)	
6. Zimbabwe (Mbire)	

Youth, indigenous people, and civil society organizations are among the key actors and partners of the MFL program. Emphasis lies in engagement, capacity sharing, and job creation.

Technical contributions. [CIRAD](#) and [CIFOR-ICRAF](#), are contributing to the conceptualization of the Program and are providing technical input enhancing the Program’s conceptual framework. CIRAD is actively involved in coordinating and co-implementing the Agroecology Living Labs and MELIA and leads the country coordination efforts in Senegal. CIFOR-ICRAF has been deeply engaged in the Program since its proposal development phase, leading AoW 6 and supporting country coordination in Kenya. Researchers from Universities like Wageningen University and Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna di Pisa have been involved in the design of specific Program activities. Three senior researchers from WUR and CIRAD, who are part of [The Netherlands \(NL\) - CGIAR research program](#), are contributing to improve the technical design and conceptual framework of MFL SP.

Strategic partnership agreements. Formal partnership agreements are being structured with CIRAD and CIFOR-ICRAF, to be signed soon. This is also the case of more than 20 national implementing partners.

Networking and participation in high-level events. [The 16th Conference of Parties \(COP\)](#) to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) provided an excellent opportunity for the Program to consult and engage with strategic partners on [landscapes](#), and related Program topics in at least six side-events with Program participation. The exiting collaboration with the global network of [WOCAT](#) will be further harnessed to support implementing suitable SLM technologies across landscapes and promoting partnerships. Additionally, a Sustainability Week organized by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia highlighted the Program focus areas. During the CBD [COP 16 in Cali](#), the MFL SP hosted highly relevant sessions with partners on [Living Labs](#), [Nature-Positive solutions](#), [Digital innovation for land restoration and biodiversity](#) a session on restoration with IUCN and GEF. The sessions co-hosted [1000 Landscapes](#), [WOCAT](#), [Commonland](#), and others were instrumental to advance further collaborations including signing MoUs. Furthermore, the Program attracted significant interest during the recent [International Agrobiodiversity Congress 2025 International Agrobiodiversity Congress 2025](#) in China, co-organized by the Alliance Bioversity-CIAT.

3. Theory of change and MELIA

3.1 Theory of change

The Multifunctional Landscapes Program applies transdisciplinary approaches and works with relevant Programs and Accelerators building on well-established partnerships and forging new ones to co-identify, co-design, and co-implement systemic interventions that harmonize environmental sustainability with human development goals and help develop biodiverse, productive, resilient, and low emissions land and aquascapes. It integrates agricultural, ecological, aquatic, and other ecosystems from ‘source to sea.’ The major assumption that underpins the underlying Program logic is that that: **By collaboratively designing nutrition-sensitive solutions rooted in agroecological, nature-positive, regenerative, conservation, and restoration principles—supported by inclusive business models, enabling governance, coherent policies, grounded in near-real time evidence and continuous learning— and implementing these solutions in priority ecosystems through integrated landscape approaches, it is possible to help realize healthier and more nutritious food systems, foster resilient and equitable livelihoods, and enhance biodiversity and ecosystem gains.**

Major research questions are:

1. How can multifunctional landscapes be effectively managed through optimal bundles of eco-agrifood system solutions that simultaneously enhance productivity, biodiversity, nutrition security, resilience, and social equity while minimizing trade-offs across different landscape contexts?
2. What institutional frameworks, governance models, and collective action mechanisms best support inclusive and adaptive landscape management, enabling coordination across scales and empowering diverse stakeholders including women, youth, and marginalized communities?
3. How can fair and inclusive market mechanisms, business models, and policy instruments be co-designed to capture economic and non-economic values of ecosystem services, attract finance, and incentivize equitable generation of multiple benefits while strengthening organizational capacity of local communities?
4. What transformative approaches, strategies, and enabling conditions promote scaling and replication of evidence-based solutions within and between landscapes while optimizing gender equality, social inclusion, food sovereignty, and quality of life outcomes?
5. What cost-effective, participatory tools and assessment frameworks can measure risks, impacts, trade-offs, and synergies of multifunctional landscape interventions in near real-time while empowering diverse stakeholders with Evidence-based decision-making capabilities?
6. How can the Multifunctional Landscapes Program strategically align with larger investment Programs, global commitments, and partnerships to maximize impact at scale while fostering knowledge sharing and influencing policy discourse through cutting-edge scientific evidence?

These questions are addressed through seven Areas of Work (AoWs): 1. Solutions and Innovations: agroecology, nature-positive, regenerative, and nutrition-sensitive, 2. Landscape Planning and Governance, 3. Markets and Business Models, 4. Institutions and Policies, 5. Gender Equality, Social Inclusion and Fairness, 6. Performance Assessment and Evidence Generation, 7. Global Engagement and Learning

The Program’s work is guided by the high-level vision presented in Section 1.1.

The Program uses an iterative process to identify, test, and validate bundles of solutions and innovations at the farm, common-pool resource, and protected areas levels, including climate-smart adaptation and mitigation strategies and recommendations, through targeted advisory support (AoW 1). This enables stakeholders to engage in agroecology, nature-positive, regenerative and nutrition-sensitive approaches optimizing landscape functionality from farms to protected areas. The assumption is that adoption is fostered by providing bundles that address specific needs in a transdisciplinary manner, supported by national and regional stakeholders who are willing and able to articulate their efforts to scale them. Priority investment areas are identified based on shared visions of landscapes actors, establishing inclusive land use plans and governance structures to optimize management vis-à-vis landscape conditions and socio-economic characteristics (AoW 2). The assumption is that landscape stakeholders are willing and able to

engage with new or existing multistakeholder platforms, supported by science-based processes and tools adapted to fit their needs.

The bundles of solutions and innovations are supported by increased organizational and marketing capacity, co-designed business models, market and non-market mechanisms for ecosystem services, and adapted financial mechanisms (AoW 3), assuming that landscape stakeholders articulate their efforts to effectively co-design, develop, implement, and scale these market and financial innovations. Co-designed tools, evidence, and dialogue spaces will enable stakeholders to inform policy changes, incentives, coordination mechanisms, and institutions advancing multifunctionality at multiple levels (AoW 4). The assumption is that Program partners are willing and able to effectively engage with and influence decision-makers at national and regional levels, who are motivated to participate actively in the co-development, coordination, and promotion of policy processes. Additionally, the prioritized incentives empower farmers and other food system actors to adopt, participate in, and scale multifunctional landscapes approaches. Gender equality, youth, and social inclusion, responsive and transformative approaches enable stakeholder participation in multifunctional landscape spaces and co-design of policies addressing marginalized people's challenges, leading to social incentives and behavioral change mechanisms that drive the transitions toward thriving multifunctional landscapes (AoW 5). The assumption is that a better understanding of issues like quality of life, social equity and food sovereignty enables landscape stakeholders to operationalize incentives for social change.

Comprehensive set of tools and indicators, holistic as well as context-specific assessment frameworks capture diverse performance dimensions linked to the solutions and innovations fostered, and the piloting of digital twin landscapes, support Evidence-based decision-making (AoW6). The key assumption is that landscape stakeholders consider performance evidence as a critical component for effective decision making (planning, prioritizing, targeting). Communities of Practice, equipped with knowledge management toolkits, enable Program partners to communicate on the solutions optimizing landscape multifunctionality. Cross-CGIAR assessment frameworks contribute to the incorporation of impact indicators on environmental health, biodiversity, and ecosystem services in the institutional strategies of CGIAR and regional and global stakeholders. The MFL SP engagement and advocacy framework supports partners engaged in updating NBSAPs and LDN targets aligned with sustainability goals (7). The key assumption is that CGIAR and the Program partners actively engage in knowledge sharing to strengthen their influence in agenda setting and policy discourse through user-centered and scientifically-sound resources.

The Program employs transdisciplinary action research methods in a bottom-up partnership strategy ensuring continuity and local ownership. International research Centers (CIFOR-ICRAF, CIRAD, 1000 Landscapes), universities (Wageningen University), and national research partners co-lead the research based on expertise and country presence.

The Program collaborates with Scaling for Impact to facilitate scaling efforts of multifunctional landscapes research. To advance the collaboration, the MFL SP has shared a plan consisting of ten activities (e.g., Living Labs, My Farm Trees, Circular Economy, Rangeland Management, Crop-Livestock Integration, etc.) that are included under the S4I work plan. Interaction with Better Diets and Nutrition, Climate Action, Sustainable Farming, Sustainable Animal and Aquatic Foods and Genebanks Programs support outcomes linked to nutrition-sensitive solutions, climate adaptation and mitigation efforts. Collaboration with Capacity Sharing enhances capacity and knowledge sharing on landscapes' multifunctionality.

The impact assessment strategy aims to gauge the outcomes of interventions in multifunctional landscapes at different levels, from farmers, to organizations, market systems, policies and global actors. This strategy also seeks a clear understanding of the mechanisms and reasons behind the impacts achieved under the main Program assumption, as outlined in the MELIA plan.

During inception, each AoW reviewed the ToC through a series of virtual meetings supported by the MELIA and Coordination Focal Points. All intermediary outcomes and 2030 Program Outcomes were reformulated to explicitly emphasize the landscape perspective and behavioral changes the Program aims to contribute to for boundary partners, next and end users. HLOs were revised and increased to better reflect logic, scales, capacity strengthening and engagement strategies. Research questions and assumptions were also revised and modified accordingly.

Whilst all components of the ToC are covered by pool funding, all HLOs and outcomes are also supported by W3/bilateral funding (over 70%), to various extents. As it stands now, 12 bilateral projects contribute to outputs and outcomes, particularly in India, Kenya, Colombia and Peru (7 bilaterals), with remaining bilaterals supporting cross-learning and scaling in Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Chile, Cameroon, Ecuador, Ethiopia, and Malaysia. This is a rough mapping that will be refined in the second phase of Program revision in 2025. [Link to digitized ToC tables.](#)

3.2 Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, and Impact Assessment (MELIA)

MEL: The MFL SP MEL system focuses on performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting to assess the contribution of agroecological, nature positive and nutrition-sensitive solutions to thriving multifunctional landscapes through inclusive governance, market mechanisms, and evidence-informed policy. We implement formative and summative evaluations to assess progress on monitored indicators, actively involving stakeholders to ensure engagement, relevance and use of results. Evaluation activities focus on qualifying monitoring results across different Areas of Work (AoWs) and their interconnections, integrating evidence from AoW6 and assessment results from AoWs 1-5. This approach bridges monitoring and learning for effective Program adaptation. Learning mechanisms are embedded in yearly Program reviews and in mid-term and final outcome-evaluations.

The MEL system operates through three key components. Performance indicators on all HLOs use an Output Tracker adapted for PRMS, with quarterly data collection by country focal points to monitor Program delivery on knowledge, capacity, and innovations. Performance indicators on Intermediate and Final Outcomes employ Actor Engagement and Outcome Journals to track behavioral changes across seven domains: agricultural, environmental, social, organizational, market, governance, and policy practices, analyzed against agroecology and nature positive principles. Partnership quality assessed yearly through key informant interviews to monitor partnership evolution and improve coordination.

The evaluation plan unpacks the Program’s core assumption through four major questions: What institutional frameworks and governance models best support sustainable landscape management and promote articulation across scales toward multifunctionality? Through which mechanisms do multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary science generate consensus in stakeholder decision-making, shaping governance and policy processes? How does scientifically sound, context-relevant evidence influence uptake at multiple decision-making levels? Which mechanisms generate fair, inclusive markets and business models that attract finance and incentivize equitable generation of multiple ecosystem services for diverse users?

Feedback from the ‘light touch’ EA review has been considered into the submitted version of ToC and MELIA plan. The outcomes have been reformulated to specify the landscape stakeholders; the ToC narrative has been revised to better reflect the research questions and approaches underlying the Program logic, as well as to make more explicit the causal linkages driving the Program ToC and the integration of the AoWs. Different options for mergers have been discussed during the inception phase. Decisions will be taken for 2026 onward when we submit next year’s work plans. These will also affect ToC and MELIA plans. The Program is looking forward to work with IEAS team to further improve MELIA approaches and evaluability.

Impact Assessment: Our Impact Assessment (IA) framework employs multi-level studies (from farmers to policy makers) combining quantitative counterfactual analysis with outcome evaluation methods that capture multidimensional and unexpected consequences of Multifunctional Landscapes approaches. Through in-depth case studies, we assess mechanisms underlying the adoption of solution and innovation bundles that optimize landscape multifunctionality (2030 OC1), examining the role of inclusive governance (2030 OC2 and OC4), market incentives (2030 OC3 and OC4), and policy frameworks (2030 OC3 and OC4).

Adoption and Impact Assessment: Using quantitative causal inference and existing baselines from Agroecology and Nature Positive Initiatives across Peru, Colombia, Tunisia, Kenya, and India, we assess adoption of agroecological solutions (2030 OC1) and their impacts (when feasible) on socio-economic outcomes and food security. By combining counterfactual-based quantitative

assessments with innovative evaluation methods, we address the methodological challenge of adequately assessing complex multifunctional landscape approaches.

The budget for MELIA activities is distributed between core MELIA studies within the cross-cutting budget; and Center-specific MELIA budget for yearly pause and reflect workshops and eventual data collection. Moreover, country coordinators have assigned 10 to 15% staff time of eight country MELIA focal points (Zimbabwe, India, Peru, Colombia, Tanzania, Tunisia, Senegal, and Kenya) that support MELIA activities throughout the implementation of the Program. **(See the MELIA plan attachment)**

4. Comparative advantage analysis

The comparative advantage analysis conducted shows that CGIAR is well-positioned to lead across the ten aggregated High-Level Outputs, while also identifying areas where collaboration with global and regional partners is essential, and where partners have specific comparative advantage to provide specific inputs. It is also worth noting that the analysis will be conducted at each landscape to identify local and national partners. Still, this analysis is not reported on here and is led and conducted by country coordinators on an ongoing basis. CGIAR's general strength lies in its interdisciplinary scientific capacity, long-term country presence, established learning landscapes, and strong relationships with national partners. This positions the MFL SP to lead in co-developing bundled solutions for landscape transformation and in advancing productivity, climate resilience, and nutrition security through the use of adaptive technologies and agroecological practices.

For land-use optimization and planning, policy, and governance, CGIAR's scientific credibility and modelling tools are substantial assets; however, coordination with actors such as FAO, ILC, and WRI enhances reach and policy alignment. To facilitate cross-learning and experience sharing, the SP can consider collaboration with 1000 Landscapes, Commonland, WOCAT, WRI and others. To data- and model-intensive application to agriculture and environment, CGIAR has great capacity constituted under its Digital Solutions Program and similar structure under different Centers. However, it can also benefit from particular entities who are more specialized and focused work on modelling and AI solutions such as Microsoft, Google, [OpenGeoHub](#), [QED](#), and others who are already cooperating with the CGIAR and/or Centers. In consumer-aligned market innovations and inclusive finance, CGIAR has relevant analytical tools but benefits from strategic collaboration with groups like the Rainforest Alliance, Slow Food, and GLF to link science with market transformation and investment platforms. In areas such as GEYSI and behavioral change, as well as the design of capacity-sharing strategies, CGIAR contributes foundational expertise but recognizes the added value of partners with grassroots engagement experience, including CARE and RRI. While CGIAR leads on data integration and performance modelling, it also leverages external digital partnerships to strengthen open, interoperable systems with external digital partnerships to strengthen open, interoperable systems. Building on its internal capacities, the CGIAR can benefit from collaborating with partnering who are advanced in digital solutions such as Microsoft, Google, [OpenGeoHub](#), [QED](#).

This analysis has guided the refinement of the Program partnership approach, ensuring complementarity, scalability, and high-impact delivery across all workstreams. Importantly, the CA analysis is not a static exercise. It has served as a learning tool to support continuous adaptation, particularly in guiding the Program's entry points for scaling, resource allocation, and capacity investment. As the MFL SP enters implementation, these comparative insights continue to guide how and where CGIAR science contributes most effectively within an increasingly complex landscape of actors and demands (**see the Comparative Advantage analysis attachment**).

5. Prioritization

5.1 Knowledge-driven priorities

The knowledge-driven prioritization process indicates that the MFL SP has the greatest potential for impact through its High-Level Outputs (HLOs) in the areas of environmental health and biodiversity, and climate adaptation and mitigation. This potential impact is particularly pronounced in South Asia (SA), Southeast Asia and the Pacific (SEA), and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).

When these findings are considered alongside foresight and different enabling environments in the regions, the MFL SP also demonstrates potential to contribute to poverty reduction, food security, and gender and social inclusion in East and Southern Africa (ESA), South Asia (SA), and West and Central Africa (WCA). This implies that the HLOs have the potential to provide tailored, climate-smart solutions and innovations for improved and inclusive agricultural productivity in these regions. South Asia is prioritized for nearly all Impact Areas demonstrating the potential to undertake integrated activities to deliver multiple impacts. As it stands now, the Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA) region is less prioritized. However, it is an important Silvo pastoral and dryland system that needs further attention and that the MFL SP would like to engage with.

The results related to HLOs focusing on solutions and innovations (under AoW1) show regional variations on impact areas that underscore the importance of tailoring human-centered design and transdisciplinary approaches to match specific regional contexts, ensuring that co-innovation strategies for sustainable landscape management align with local stakeholder priorities. For example, prioritization guides to focus innovation co-development in LAC and SEA on environment and climate and on food security and poverty in regions such as South Asia and East and Southern Africa.

Prioritization of HLOs on landscape planning and governance (AoW2) shows opportunities to contribute to participatory governance structures in addressing distinct landscape challenges. For example, high priorities on the establishment of Living Landscapes in East and Southern Africa and South Asia suggest potential contribution to fostering stakeholder collaboration through the development of shared visions for multifunctional landscapes.

HLOs to deliver better markets, business models and financial mechanisms (AoW3) demonstrate diverse connections with impact areas. South Asia shows a high prioritization for food security interventions suggesting that those HLOs in this region should focus on developing value chains and business models that enhance access to sustainable food products while strengthening local food systems. The HLOs related to markets and business models in Latin America and the Caribbean focus on climate adaptation and environmental health priorities, indicating that market-based mechanisms in this region should emphasize consumer choices for climate-resilient products and financial incentives for conservation practices.

HLOs evidence from enabling institutions and policies (AoW4) prioritization displays a higher impact on food security and poverty reduction in South Asia and East and Southern Africa and a moderate impact on climate and environment in Latin America and the Caribbean, South Asia and Southeast Asia and the Pacific.

The prioritization results for HLOs on gender equality, social inclusion and fairness (AoW5) show regional disparities. East and Southern Africa and West and Central Africa emerges as the regions with the most potential impact on GEYSI, particularly for poverty reduction interventions, indicating severe gender-based and social exclusion challenges that are hampering rural development and individual well-being in these landscapes.

HLOs on evidence-based performance assessment (AoW6) are considered global outputs because the information that will be generated can be context specific and can be used throughout the different intervention sites. For example, the widespread use of holistic landscape assessment frameworks that combine harmonized datasets to inform global dialogues with locally defined indicators and data that inform landscape-level decision making on which interventions have the highest potential for improving environmental health.

Prioritization of HLOs on global engagement, advocacy and learning (AoW7) found common priorities including community engagement, education and training, and policy development. These elements are crucial for integrating environmental health and climate resilience into development projects and strengthening cross-border collaborations. (For details related to the prioritization exercise, please **See Prioritization attachment**).

5.2 Final decisions on the Program/Accelerator's direction and design

By its nature, the MFLs Program will not prioritize 'single-purpose' objectives as its basic principle is to reconcile economic – environment objectives. The program thus prioritizes production-conservation-restoration that sustain socio-ecological gains. Based on the results of the prioritization exercise, South Asia fits well – where nearly all the five Impact Areas are prioritized (Climate Adaptation, Environmental Health, and Food Security ranked as 'very high' priorities and Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion as 'high' priorities. Southern and Eastern Africa is another priority region where contribution can be made towards achieving three of the Impact Areas (Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion as 'very high' priorities and Food Security as 'high' priority). In this region, Climate Adaptation and Environmental Health scored 'medium' priority. Considering the vision of the MFL SP (reconcile agricultural and environmental goals), site selection (countries and landscapes) can be considered to accommodate production landscapes (major priority) coinciding with restoration/conservation needs. The Western and Central Africa region has ranked 'high' priority for Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion while it ranked 'medium' for Food Security. The Program may have 'satellite' sites to work in the region. The Latin America and the Caribbean ('very high') and Southeast Asia ('high') are prioritized for Climate Change and Environmental Health while these regions are prioritized as 'low' for the other three Impact Areas. The MFL SP is planning to pursue activities in the Mekong region bordering Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam focusing on balancing development with environmental protection, particularly regarding hydropower development and its impact on water, forest and biodiversity resources as well as addressing the water quality degradation, improving transboundary water governance and the effects of climate change like increased flooding and drought.

The knowledge-driven prioritization serves as one input among several in the Program's decision-making. Given that the MFL SP builds on an understanding of landscapes as complex and interlinked social-ecological systems, additional factors relevant to allocating decisions are: 1) strategic alignment with funder priorities, 2) partner readiness and capacity in target regions, 3) cross-portfolio dependencies and synergies between HLOs, 4) resource constraints and implementation feasibility, 5) stakeholder engagement and enabling conditions, and 6) previous progress on projects and initiatives.

MFLs are distinct in that they have evolved to simultaneously deliver multiple, interdependent outputs. The implementation of the MFL SP is grounded in the recognition that landscapes exist at different stages of development and, as such, require different configurations of HLOs to deliver impacts for both people and nature. Thus, the program adopts a platform-based approach to landscape transformation. It is structured in a phased approach prioritizing HLOs at sites where the landscaping approach is in its early stages and gradually expanding to other HLOs as the landscape evolves. For example, in countries such as Peru, Tunisia, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Senegal, India, and Lao PDR, prior donor support has already established important groundwork for landscape approaches. Consequently, less emphasis is placed on HLOs that focus on establishing the basic elements of a landscape approach, as these countries have already made substantial progress in stakeholder engagement and have developed a shared vision for collaborative action within living landscapes. Therefore, the potential for impact in these contexts is maximized by prioritizing HLOs that enable landscape actors to advance through the adoption of improved business models, the co-development of climate and environmental innovations, and the strengthening of governance frameworks that foster an enabling environment for sustainable landscape management.

Countries such as Colombia, Tanzania, and Viet Nam have recently become involved under a landscape framework. In these countries, priority is given to foundational HLOs—specifically,

implementing vision-to-action, the development of comprehensive datasets on landscape stakeholders and environmental priorities, the collaborative planning of land and resource use to balance social, economic, and environmental objectives, and the establishment of inclusive governance and management structures. Additionally, the integration of gender-transformative and youth-inclusive approaches ensures that these vision-to-action processes are equitable and participatory. These HLOs serve as essential vehicles for stakeholder engagement, the co-development of innovations, and the use of improved data for Evidence-based decision making in emerging landscape initiatives.

An important consideration is also the fact that the MFL SP considers systems approach and intends to optimize synergetic solutions that support achieving production-restoration-conservation objectives (minimizing compromises on environmental health while promoting economic gains and vice versa). As a result, it may not be wise to prioritize ‘environment’ related solutions in some regions (e.g., SA, SEA, LAC) focusing solely on poverty reduction and food security in others (e.g., SWA, WCA). It is thus wise to interpret the prioritization of results carefully. Detailed observation related to ‘secondary’ priorities may enable us to make sure that the environment-economy dependencies can be considered, thus we do not tend to priority ‘individual impact areas’.

During the prioritization exercise, the team observed that having a large number of HLOs (30 in total), many of which are complementary, posed challenges for effective ranking. It was also noted that clustering or grouping complementary HLOs could reduce redundancy and enhance synergy.

In light of these insights—and reflecting the feedback from ISDC, GLT, and several partners—a proposal is made to consolidate some Areas of Work (AoWs). Specifically:

- **AoW4 (Policy and Institutions)** could be merged with **AoW2**, resulting in a newly titled AoW: *Landscape Planning, Governance, Policy, and Institutions*. Under this AoW, there will be a sub-AoW covering most of the work under the existing AoW4. Some elements of the Policy and Institutions AoW can also be included under AoW3 and AoW7.
- **AoW5** is suggested to serve as a **cross-cutting theme**, supporting all AoWs. Key elements of the current AoW5 will be included as sub-AoWs across the Program.

In both cases, dedicated budgets and staffing will be allocated to ensure that relevant activities are effectively planned and implemented.

Finally, we suggest that the methodology be strengthened by incorporating additional approaches and cross-validating the results with relevant data sources. This would help ensure a more accurate alignment between identified problems and proposed solutions.

It is also important to note that the use of pre-assigned weights for certain regions, indicators, and Impact Areas may have influenced the resulting regional priorities.

6. Alignment of W3 and bilaterally funded work

From the 28 bilateral projects mapped to the SP, 12 have been qualified with high complementarity of results. The 28 projects have been aligned in the ToC to all of the Multifunctional Landscapes SP 2030 outcomes, and 12 of the 30 HLOs. The 28 bilaterals represent a total approximate budget mapped to the program of 48 million USD.

Fourteen bilaterals are mapped to AoW1 covering topics of land management, restoration and conservation. Nine bilaterals deal with market systems (AoW3), focusing on private sector incentives, youth-citizen science-e-commerce, cacao and tree seed value chains. Three bilaterals are related to policy and institutional analysis and mapped to AoW4, and two focus on gender, youth and social inclusion approaches (AoW5). Secondary linkages cover all seven AoWs of the Program. The bilaterals cover 31 countries, six of which coincide with the MFL SP prioritized countries: Colombia, India, Kenya, Peru, Tanzania and Viet Nam. The bilaterals are led by six Centers: 14 by the Alliance Bioversity-CIAT, 3 by ICRISAT, 3 by IWMI, 2 each by CIMMYT, CIP and Worldfish, and one each for the Centers IFPRI and ILRI.

The bilateral projects show a few potential gaps and should be prioritized for targeted fundraising:

- 1. Nutrition-Specific Outcomes:** While sustainability and regenerative practices are emphasized, explicit links to **nutrition-sensitive approaches** (e.g., diet diversity, micronutrient outcomes) may be underrepresented.
- 2. Scalable Financing Models:** Some projects mention market mechanisms, but there may be a gap in **innovative, scalable financing models** (e.g., blended finance, carbon markets) specifically designed for landscape-level regenerative systems.
- 3. Systemic Policy Coherence:** There may be insufficient focus on aligning cross-sectoral policies (agriculture, health, climate, trade) that support integrated landscape approaches.
- 4. Digital Tools for Monitoring:** The use of **digital innovations and geospatial tools** for real-time, Evidence-based performance assessment may be limited or fragmented.

7. Plan of Results and Budget

The PORB is structured to ensure strategic alignment between funding allocations and the delivery of the Program's seven AoWs, each contributing to the Program's HLOs. Given the significant Window 2 allocation confirmed beyond April 2025, the focus is on consolidating the implementation of the B-Real project activities while enabling complementary activities that strengthen delivery across AoWs.

Allocations to AoW.

The most significant budget shares are allocated to **AoW 1 (Solutions and Innovations)** and **AoW 2 (Landscape Planning and Governance)**, reflecting their central role in deploying agroecological, regenerative, and nutrition-sensitive interventions within multifunctional landscapes. This funding supports research teams, national and regional partners, and targeted studies that ground innovations in context-specific realities. **AoW 3 (Markets and Business Models)** and **AoW4 (Institutions and Policies)** receive the second largest allocations, supporting work on inclusive, climate-resilient business models and enabling policy environments. Their activities are designed to complement and support outputs from Areas of Work (AoWs) 1 and 2 by embedding them within sustainable market and governance systems.

AoW 5 (Gender Equality, Social Inclusion, and Fairness) plays a critical cross-cutting role. Its budget primarily supports integration efforts across AoWs, ensuring that equity dimensions are embedded in solution design, implementation, and assessment processes.

AoW 6 (Performance Assessment and Evidence Generation) is funded to ensure robust monitoring and evaluation, including tools to assess trade-offs, co-benefits, and impact pathways across multiple dimensions—productivity, resilience, nutrition, and inclusion.

AoW 7 (Global Engagement and Learning) plays a catalytic role in capturing and sharing learning across sites and geographies and aligning the Program with global policy processes.

Given the limited ability to introduce new activities, most of the 2025 PORB is dedicated to full-time equivalent (FTE) staff and strategic partnerships already contributing to the Program's delivery. Allocations are being used to commission small, complementary studies at the eleven selected sites, which align closely with Initiative-level work plans and reinforce existing delivery streams and are already contributing to the delivery of the MFL SP as a whole.

While the PORB does not introduce major shifts, it enables targeted deepening of priority work areas and provides space for cross-AoW collaboration, such as embedding performance metrics within policy work or integrating social inclusion into landscape governance. This supports a coherent, systems-based approach without expanding the programmatic footprint.

In summary, the PORB maintains a tight implementation focus, ensuring continuity, coherence, and delivery within a resource-constrained context while still allowing room for integrated, adaptive learning and value-added contributions from new partnerships and analytical work.

Management costs. In the AoW 00 the Centers allocated the management costs for interim directors, PMU, AoW leads and co-leads. Management costs were calculated at 50% of the FTE for interim directors, PMU and AoW leads, and 25% of the FTE for AoW co-leads.

Partners non-CGIAR. In addition to the management costs mentioned above, the Centers in the Alliance (Bioversity and CIAT) have allocated to AoW 00 the budget for cross-cutting non-CGIAR partners. The Alliance Bioversity CIAT is responsible for most of the contracted partners in the MFL, which represent USD 2.3 million in the Alliance's budget.

In addition to the W1/W2 funding, the PORB presents the most significant W3 bilateral projects that have been mapped to the MFL SP. A total of USD 13.3 million has been mapped to the MFL SP, by six of the ten CGIAR Centers participating in this mapping. The list of bilateral projects presented in the PORB is not exhaustive, as 28 bilateral projects were reported by the Centers as linked to the MFL SP. **(See the PORB attachment).**

8. Cross-Portfolio linkages and geographic coordination

8.1. Cross-portfolio linkages

The MFL SP will closely work with many of the Programs and Accelerators. The main ones with which advanced discussions have been made include Sustainable Farming, Climate Action, Digital Transformation, Genebanks, Gender Equality and Inclusion, Sustainable Animal and Aquatic Foods, and Scaling for Impact. Through our collaboration with the different Programs and Accelerators, we will be able to share lessons, experiences, resources, and solutions that can enable the MFL agenda and avail integrated bundled and tailored solutions for the S4I Program. Some example engagements with two of the SP are described below.

Sustainable Farming: The MFL SP and Sustainable Farming Programs identified key collaboration areas. Two initial priorities relate to enhancing water management and integrating land sharing - land sparing strategies within the farm-landscapes interface.

1. **Sustainable Water Development and Use:** MFL SP focuses on landscape-scale restoration to improve ecosystem services like water availability. Sustainable Farming complements this with equitable water use strategies at farm and system levels. A concept note with CRS outlines co-implementation and fundraising.
2. **Land-Sparing and Land-Sharing Strategies:** Both Programs are undertaking a meta-analysis to clarify trade-offs and enabling conditions for implementing these strategies across the farm-landscape continuum. A joint position paper is planned, with support from CIRAD.

Given limited budgets and time, the Programs will: (a) Await site prioritization to identify co-located areas for joint water initiatives; (b) Advance the meta-analysis on land-sharing/sparing for future implementation.

Climate Action: MFL and the Climate Action SPs collaborate on farm, landscape, and aquatic system levels, with an emphasis on locally led adaptation. Joint efforts at MFL sites aim to support climate adaptation by developing financing mechanisms, locally driven solutions, and integrating local priorities into policy. Plans include setting up common sites using the living labs approach with shared equipment for monitoring. (See Section 8.2)

8.2 Geographic coordination

Geographic coordination is guided by the **Living Labs approach**, which uses participatory, place-based methods to address interconnected food, climate, and biodiversity challenges. The approach fosters co-learning and adaptive management, supported by shared research infrastructure and data systems. Living Labs bridge research and practice, build trust, and enhance the relevance and scalability of solutions. The [Agroecology Initiative co-created 11 Agroecology Living Landscapes](#) using the Living Lab approach in eight countries.

Once site prioritization is finalized across Programs, common sites will be identified for coordinated action. This builds on previous discussions with Programs such as Sustainable Farming, Climate Action, Sustainable Animal and Aquatic Food Systems, Genebanks, and Scaling for Impact. The MFL SP is also engaging in knowledge exchange with global platforms like the Global Landscapes Forum and regional networks such as DyTAES in Senegal. In Kenya, MFL SP and Sustainable Farming may collaborate in areas where both operate, alongside partners like TNC Chef-Foodscapes (see Section 2).

The Program is adapting and apply a [vision-to-action approach](#) to define transition pathways toward multifunctionality. Results will be shared across the CGIAR Science Programs community. MFL sites may serve as shared spaces for joint action research involving diverse stakeholders.

Geographic coordination enhances scaling opportunities and fosters holistic partnerships. Potential joint benefits include:

- Integrated water management, intercropping systems (Sustainable Farming)
- Crop-fish-livestock integration (Animal and Aquatic Food Systems)
- Nutrition-focused behavioral change (Better Diets)
- Locally led adaptation (Climate Action)
- Innovation scaling (Scaling for Impact)

9. Risk Management

Please refer to the following [link](#) with the Program/Accelerator's full risk register. This link is open to ISDC colleagues and others will be granted access, on request.

Please note that risks 6-8 were added taking into account the reviewer's suggestions.

#	Category	Title	Description	Current Risk Level	Target Risk Level	Actions /Controls to manage risks
1	Business continuity	Natural disasters, geopolitical dynamics and diseases outbreaks.	Potential local or national social unrests, natural disasters and diseases outbreaks in some of the countries in which we will implement Multifunctional Landscapes Program may result into partial or complete cessation of activities impacting deliverables.	6	6	(1) Monitor situation in the sites selected for implementation.; (2) The MFL SP has prioritized countries where this type of risk is considered to be low.
2	Research innovation	Conflicting consequences of innovations for environmental, productivity, social and economic aspects.	There are some key tradeoffs among environmental and productivity targets and social and economic objectives, not only for households but for other actors across landscapes. These challenge the calculation of return on investments for all relevant actors.	4	4	(1) Conducting trade-off analyses.; (2) Identifying options to optimize synergies and reduce trade-offs.
3	Partners and Partnerships	Inability to incentivize behaviors needed for adoption, in landscape stakeholders.	Inability to find and apply suitable incentives that compensate tradeoffs in adoption of solutions could prevent landscape stakeholders from adopting desired behaviors for successful implementation. Adaptive management will be applied to inform iterations of incentives to minimize bottlenecks.	4	4	(1) Consulting and involving stakeholders during the planning and implementation of activities; (2) Implementing adaptive management strategies.
4	Funding	Funding received is lower than funding forecast used to plan activities.	Activities are planned based on budget estimations, made on a funding forecast. Changes in national policies and donor guidelines might affect the accuracy of such forecast, therefore actual funding could be lower than expected. This would require changes in the plan of activities.	4	4	(1) Implementing adaptive financial and technical management strategies; (2) Monitoring funding situation.
5	Business continuity	Operational disruptions from	Changes in management mechanisms, leadership teams, and budgets can disrupt the	4	4	Developing and implementing SP and AoW work plans.

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

		management changes.	MFL SP operations and activities, potentially affecting program deliverables.			
6	Business continuity	Conflicting landscape actors and disconnected sectoral plans.	Conflicting landscape actors and disconnected sectoral plans can undermine timely execution and delivery of results.	4	4	Continuous engagement to clarify issues and create harmony. Develop sound land use and management plans to demonstrate the benefit of synergizing efforts.
7	Business continuity	Government priority shifts.	Potential shift of government priorities and request for alignment, which can divert attention.	4	4	Adjust aspects of the program as necessary. Collaborate to raise funding. Engage and explain if not possible to adjust.
8	Business continuity	Expectation of 'short-term' solutions which is against MFL's time domain.	Landscape-level interventions related to integrated land and water resources management take substantial time to bear fruit. Some actors (including CGIAR) may have misunderstandings and create pressure on impact.	4	4	Closer engagement and update. Design solutions that can mix short-long term solutions. Explain vision and demonstrate through scenarios.

10. Addressing feedback on select topics

Lacks information on:	Details on how the Program/ Accelerator has addressed or will address this feedback (in the Inception Phase or beyond)
How water systems are covered in the Portfolio.	The MFL SPs Program adopts a ‘source to sea’ approach that encompasses diverse ecosystems. The development, management, and sustainable use of water—including water harvesting and irrigation—are among its central focus areas. Key water-related elements (e.g., water harvesting, watershed and waterbody management, irrigation, sustainable aquatic food production, water allocation tools to optimize water use and maintain healthy river basins, etc.) are addressed under AoW 1 and AoW 2 . See section 8.2 on collaboration with Sustainable Farming and Climate Action .
How climate mitigation is covered in the Portfolio.	Climate mitigation is a key priority in our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Program has a dedicated research question addressed in AoW1 with collaborative input from other AoWs. Prioritization shows the MFL SP has the greatest potential for impact through its HLOs in the areas of “environment” and climate adaptation and mitigation (section 5.1). Coordination is foreseen with the Climate Action SP using the living labs approach (see section 8.2).
How trade-offs and synergies in mixed systems are covered in the Portfolio.	MFL-SP aims to optimize the balance between environmental and human needs, as well as between agricultural production and restoration and biodiversity conservation. As such, synergies and trade-offs are central to its approach. AoWs 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 are dedicating substantial efforts to exploring these dynamics. Research questions across the Program are directly related, particularly in areas such as optimization, bundling of ecosystem services, and addressing issues of inequality and inclusion, requiring trade-off analysis.
How environmental health and biodiversity is covered in the Portfolio.	This Program's unique value proposition puts environmental health and biodiversity at its core (see section 1.3). It is the best positioned to deliver on the global targets on environmental health and biodiversity. EHBIA Platform is hosted under the Program. The prioritization exercise has identified environment and climate related impact areas highlighting its relevance. Five HLOs (1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 3.3, 7.4) contribute to related targets.
How orphan and opportunity crops and pulses are covered in the Portfolio.	The Program works on promoting the conservation and use of a wide portfolio of orphan and opportunity crops, including high protein legumes, minor grains, underexplored fruits, and indigenous vegetables and root crops , depending on the region and its local diversity. Conservation focuses on diversity baselines, catalogues, genetic gap analysis and inventories of the bioeconomic potential of these crops and their varietal portfolios. The use part focuses on high value markets, enhanced nutrition, involving youth engagement and biocultural education, aspects addressed mainly under AoW 1, 2, 3, 5 .
How Youth and social inclusion is covered in the Portfolio.	AoW5 HLO5.1 ‘GEYSI-responsive and transformative approaches and methodologies from the individual to the landscape scale’ is geared toward ensuring that social inclusion and youth (next to gender) are considered and operationalized across all AoWs and in all MFL sites where the creation of ‘polyvocal spaces’ ensures that all social groups can voice their interests and concerns. AoW5 plans research and policy engagement on ‘the position of youth’ and pursues the development of business cases with AoW3 specifically for Youth.
How capacity sharing is covered in the Portfolio.	Capacity sharing is addressed in all AoWs mainly through HLOs 1.6, 2.1–2.4, 3.1, 4.2, 4.5, 7.1–7.3 which strengthen access to knowledge, empower local actors, improve adoption rates, and foster innovation . AoW 7 (HLOs 7.1-7.3) has a specific focus on capacity sharing . The Living Lab and Vision to Action approach , already employed within the Agroecology Initiative (OP 2.2 and see section 8.2), assures that research approaches are demand-driven and locally led. AoW 2 , in collaboration with other AoWs, is building internal capacity for transdisciplinary approaches for all stakeholder and partner engagements which break away from colonial research practices. To strengthen these efforts AoW 5 will organize internal reflection workshops and briefs on the decolonization of research and other relevant, emerging topics. AoW5 will also strengthen internal SP capacity for conducting gender-responsive research with an intersectional lens.

Appendix 1: Addressing specific feedback

Feedback (synthesized)	Responses for inception report
<p><u>Overall weakness No.1:</u> <i>“Requires clarification on how Area of Work 6 ‘Performance Assessment and Evidence’ may integrate outputs from Areas of Work 1, 2, and 3 that will be used for MELIA and quantifying their impact on Gender, Policy and Education outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>We recommend that Areas of Work 4, 5 and 7 be merged”.</i></p>	<p>On AoW6 and output integration, see section 1.3, Outcome 5. AoW 6 has been designed with the dual role of informing research, implementation and support MEL reporting and IA. The MELIA focal point is part of the AoW6 core team and ensures bridging evidence generated in AoW6 and MELIA, to report on Outcome and Impact targets.</p> <p>On merging some AoWs, options have been discussed during the inception phase. Specifically, (a) making GEYSI crosscutting is suggested to ensure gender transformative approaches across all AoWs rather than keeping it as independent AoW; (b) key elements of Policy and Institutions (AoW4) can be integrated into AoW2, some into AoW3 and AoW7. Such adjustment will make FIVE AoWs instead of SEVEN, without losing content. This can increase effectiveness, efficiency and better alignment avoiding fragmentation. Detailed suggestions and decisions on how to ‘reorganize AoWs’ will be done during Q3-Q4 of the SP for 2026 operationalization. This will also give the upcoming Director a role to play in the redesigning exercise.</p>
<p><u>Overall weakness No.2:</u> <i>“Section 6.7 on Global engagement and Learning. More concise information on outputs, number and types of knowledge products</i></p>	<p>The AoW 7 outputs have been revised in the inception phase, and the deliverables and targets specified according to CGIAR definitions (see ToC board).</p>
<p><u>Overall weakness No.3:</u> <i>6.1. [AoW 1] seems to be a top-down approach</i></p> <p><i>More defined climate adaptation and mitigation strategies</i></p> <p><i>Include concepts and address balance of productivity, profitability and risk</i></p>	<p>Our focus under the SP is co-creation, co-design, co-implementation and co-evaluation, which are visible across the proposal. See Vision section 1.1 on co-creation and co-design of inclusive technological, socioecological, and institutional innovations. The Living Lab and Vision to Action approach, already employed within the Agroecology Initiative (OP 2.2 and section 8.2), assures that research approaches are demand-driven and locally led.</p> <p>A dedicated HLO now emphasizes the work related to climate change adaptation and mitigation. See also the response in Section 10 (second row).</p> <p>MFL SP’s unique value proposition in section 1.3 is on balance of productivity, profitability and risk. See also research question that is included under AoW1 on: “Which solutions promote synergetic gains, simultaneously enhancing farming-system productivity, livelihoods, nutrition security and resilience within different landscape settings?”</p>
<p>Criteria 1. Greater clarity of how landscapes, different ecological systems and countries are prioritized <i>Provide examples of priority landscapes</i></p> <p><i>Evidence on the value of the innovative solutions and innovations (6.1) needs strengthening. Needs better reference to Theory of Change or Tables 6.1/6.2/6.3.</i></p>	<p>Priority landscapes have been identified for 2025, with some being applicable for 2026-2030, through a Program-specific geographic prioritization exercise (see list under section 2 and Science Week presentation (minute 28,50 to 30,26)).</p> <p>Prioritization and CA assessments are ongoing processes to identify additional landscapes.</p> <p>AoW1 is about providing bundled site and context-specific solutions tailored to respective socio-economic and environmental conditions – is thus the core of the SP. The value of innovative solutions and innovations (AoW1) include creation of productive, biodiverse, low emissions, resilient landscapes. Such and other values are outlined across the SP proposal and in sections 1 and 3 of this report. has been strengthened</p>

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

<p>Criteria 2. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 2. High-level vision, Section 3. Evidence-based and demand-led prioritization and Section 7. Country integration</u> <i>Request to provide more information on stakeholder consultations, key partners, the partners providing the land for living landscapes.</i></p>	<p>Stakeholder consultations in 11 sites and with global partners (e.g., CIRAD, TPP) informed the inception phase (see Sec. 2). Continuous engagement with partners such as UNCCD, IUCN, Commonwealth Living Land Charter, GIZ, FCDO, IRD, UNEP, WOCAT, AFR100, 20x20.</p> <p>New potential partners consulted: World Resources Institute, 1000 Landscapes (EcoAgriculture Partners), Commonland, The Nature Conservancy, WOCAT, OpenGeoHub, the Kilimanjaro Project among others.</p>
<p>Criteria 3. <u>Comparative Advantage</u> <i>“The selection of priority countries and linkages across outputs is described but it is not clear why these [countries] were prioritized. And ‘NEW’ partnerships are not provided.</i></p>	<p>CA has been updated (section 4). Knowledge-driven exercise conducted (section 5) also discussing potential regional prioritization. Rational for country and site selection and new potential partners are mentioned in section 2 (also 4, 5, 6). As stated earlier these processes are continuous.</p>
<p>Criteria 4. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 2. High-level vision and Section 6. Areas of Work</u> <i>“The research questions are not supported by research hypothesis. Areas of Work: (i) Need to ensure system agronomy approaches suggested match tools and solutions to local conditions and provide comparisons with well tested approaches (conservation agriculture and sustainable intensification) across all demonstration/experimental sites (6.1); (ii) Research incentives for technology adoption and change should be more central; (iii) climate adaptation technologies to be scaled within and between landscapes should be central to the whole Program.</i></p>	<p>Research questions for AoWs have been reworked to better reflect the holistic systems approach to optimize landscape multi-functionality that the Program pursues. The emphasis on different landscape contexts directly addresses the need to match solutions to local conditions. Additionally, cost-effective, participatory tools and assessment frameworks address the need to compare to well tested approaches. The focus on fair and inclusive market mechanisms, business models, and policy instruments that can incentivize equitable generation of multiple benefit directly tackles the incentive structures needed for technology adoption.</p> <p>The Living Lab and Vision to Action approach (OP 2.2, and section 8.2) ensures that research approaches match tools and solutions to local conditions, provide comparisons with well-tested approaches, as well as research incentives of technology adoption and change by working closely with local communities and partners.</p> <p>On Climate adaptation technologies, MFL SP addresses climate-smart in AoW 1, with a dedicated HLO 1.2 and collaborative input from the market, policy, GEYSI, and performance assessment AoWs. Additionally, geographic coordination is foreseen with the Climate Action SP in MFL sites (see section 8.2)</p>
<p>Criteria 5. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 5. Program-level theory of change</u> <i>Consider reducing the number of Areas of Work to make the Program of work focus on MFL. Feasibility of funding the management of real-world proof of concepts in Areas of Work 1-2, which will be critical to MFL, should be linked to Area of Work 3 creating self-sustaining business models. Existing business models in carbon, nature-based solution and ecosystem service markets should be engaged as well as linking this work to “financial institutions” (6.3). For Area of Work 3, there are no outputs/interventions targeted at addressing costs and benefit sharing from the business models implemented</i></p>	<p>Theories of change have been extensively reviewed, refined, and better articulated. Outcomes and associated indicators have been articulated on the ToC board.</p> <p>A summary statement on the integration of all AoWs has been formulated (see paragraph 3 section 3.1).</p> <p>Different options for mergers have been discussed during the inception phase. Decisions will be taken for 2026 onward when we submit next year’s work plans. See response under “Overall Weakness 1” above.</p> <p>We agree that funding real-world proof-of-concept management in AoW1 and 2 is essential for MFL’s success. Equally important is linking this to AoW3 by developing self-sustaining business models and collaborating to strengthen them. We will explore opportunities in carbon, nature-based solutions, and ecosystem services markets, and engage financial institutions as recommended.</p> <p>We also recognize the need to address cost and benefit sharing at the landscape level. These considerations will be integrated into</p>

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

<p>at landscape level, which may be addressed in Area of Work 4. Area of Work 4 could also focus on developing policies that impact gender (Area of Work 5) and education (Area of Work 7) to bring these three themes together into one Area of Work. Area of Work 6.6 provides tangible outputs that stakeholders may use to understand the impacts of MFL and linkages to data collected from Areas of Work 1, 2 and 3 should be made explicit.</p>	<p>our work in collaboration with Area of Work 4 to support equitable benefit distribution and long-term sustainability</p>
<p>Criteria 6. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 6. Areas of Work</u> “Identify key partners for activities to ensure non-CGIAR capacity is available to support the delivery of on-ground activities. Consider systems and integrative/whole farm/landscape dynamic modelling and foresighting techniques to address the lack of evidence on the production approaches to be tested”.</p>	<p>Please see section 1.3 of this report for adapted research methods and tools. Key partners by AoW have been specified in the ToC board. Modelling and Foresighting have been addressed in section 1.3 under research methods in AoW 2, and the paragraph on Evidence-based performance assessments.</p>
<p>Criteria 7. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 11. Gender and social inclusion</u> “The outcomes do not clearly highlight how gender will impact MFL. Incorporating a specific example of how gender will be addressed in each Area of Work rather than a separate Area of Work 5 is suggested. Though the Program does provide high level outcomes aiming to advance gender equality and inclusion”.</p>	<p>The Program describes ambitious action research focusing on gender equality, youth, social inclusion, and fairness. Sub-AoW5.1 focuses on integrating GEYSI in the other AoWs through gender-responsive and gender-transformative research approaches. This includes assessing GEYSI capacity needs across AoWs and MFL SP sites and co-developing GEYSI workplans. Sub-AoW 5.2 is focused on landscape actors' agency and on how social and justice dimensions of multifunctional Landscapes can be harnessed for driving desired social change. It also includes a component on ‘improving the position of youth in MFLs’</p>
<p>Criteria 8. <u>Feedback on proposal Section 6. Areas of Work</u> There are no specific technologies or products proposed in 6.1. Nevertheless, each Area of Work includes a Table that explicitly describes “outputs and intermediate outcomes,” which are rather general.</p>	<p>Outputs and knowledge products have been reformulated significantly to be specific. However, AoW 1 technology products are less specific because the proposed solution bundles are context specific and demand driven. These solutions and innovations consist of technological, socioecological, organizational and institutional innovations aimed at enhancing food production and human diets, while also supporting ecosystem restoration, biodiversity protection as well as climate adaptation and mitigation. An innovation inventory during the inception phase collected 200 innovations in 10 years from the 3 initiatives, including for example innovations related to crop-livestock integration; bioinputs; diversification, crop associations, and seed systems; Soil-water conservation.</p>
<p>Criteria 9. <u>Feedback on Section 7. Country integration, Section 8. Boundaries and linkages with other components of the portfolio and Section 10. Capacity sharing.</u> The Identification and inclusion of key partners in this section provides evidence the Program understands who is working in what countries, although there are many gaps.</p>	<p>CA has been updated, but please notice that not all country and site-specific partners could be listed and incorporated in the CA. See section 2 on partnerships for updated approaches and section 8 on portfolio linkages.</p>
<p>Criteria 10. <u>Feedback on Section 13. Risk</u></p>	<p>For details related to “Risk Assessment” please see section 9 of this report. A complete risk management plan has been submitted</p>

Inception Report – Multifunctional Landscapes Science Program

<p><i>management “Changes should be implemented regarding value chains and associated business models. It is important that the environment and social safe-guards and/or environment and social impact assessments are in place to mitigate their potential negative impacts. This was difficult to evaluate as the document indicates that risks will be developed later during the Inception Phase”.</i></p>	<p>through the Risk Management online module of the CGIAR. A specific risk on conflicting consequences of innovations for environmental, productivity, social and economic aspects is included in such plan. See also section 10 with response to trade-offs and synergies in mixed systems.</p>
<p>Criteria 11. <u>Feedback on Section 9. MELIA and Section 10. Gender and social inclusion</u> ...How this framework will be operationalized to capture progressive changes.</p>	<p>We have revised MELIA as indicated in Section 3 of this report, and in the MELIA plan. Se response under Section 10.</p>
<p><u>Additional comment No.1:</u> “A synthesis that clarifies linkages across Areas of Work would improve the proposal. Areas of Work 1-3 and 6 have clear objectives to develop evidence that MFL will improve livelihoods. Increasing the diversity of integrated systems that are evaluated in Areas of Work 1-2 (which may be merged) and providing clearer linkages to the business models of Area of Work 3 and data interpretation of Area of Work 6 may be achieved with a holistic review of the proposal. Focusing Area of Work 4 (policy work) on how change in specific Gender and Education issues will be affected and embedding Areas of Work 5 and 7 would lead to a more focused research program and clearer proposal”.</p>	<p>Interconnection between AoWs is clarified under the MELIA plan. We will work on details and next steps. On aligning AoWs 4, 5, and 7 – please see response under “Overall weakness” (first row of this table).</p>
<p><u>Additional comment No.2:</u> “Budget and research priorities: Section 14 states that new activities will require 20% more pooled funding. What research will be prioritized?”</p>	<p>We are engaging in fund raising to complement the available budget. We also worked on different scenarios related to funding and apply that as agreed during a face-to-face meeting in the last week of April. For 2025 we have B-REAL/GAC that complements MFL SPs though B-REAL somehow affects the budget and activities of the MFL SPs.</p>
<p><u>Additional comment No.3:</u> “Area of Work 1 describes long-term research covering several growing seasons/years to validate solutions. How will this inform other Areas of Work and is there scope to introduce new innovations [...] Close connection with sustainable farming and other Programs and partners is needed to ensure the Portfolio is well integrated”.</p>	<p>Other AoWs don’t have to wait until AoW1 has results. All AoWs will start operationalization concurrently complementing each other. Detailed plan with country focal points will help alignment and integration. Further information related to aligning the SP with others is highlighted in Section 8 (sub-sections 8.1 and 8.2).</p>