



RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON
Dryland Systems

Management Response to CRP-Commissioned External Evaluation Final Report Management and Action Plan

29 November 2015

*Food security and better livelihoods
for rural dryland communities*

The CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Systems aims to improve the lives of 1.6 billion people and mitigate land and resource degradation in 3 billion hectares covering the world's dry areas. Dryland Systems engages in integrated agricultural systems research to address key socioeconomic and biophysical constraints that affect food security, equitable and sustainable land and natural resource management, and the livelihoods of poor and marginalized dryland communities. The program unifies eight CGIAR Centres and uses unique partnership platforms to bind together scientific research results with the skills and capacities of national agricultural research systems (NARS), advanced research institutes (ARIs), non-governmental and civil society organizations, the private sector, and other actors to test and develop practical innovative solutions for rural dryland communities.

The program is led by the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), a member of the CGIAR Consortium. CGIAR is a global agriculture research partnership for a food secure future.

For more information please visit:

drylandsystems.cgiar.org

SUGGESTED CITATION

CGIAR Research program on Dryland Systems 2015. Management Response to CRP External Evaluation Final Report November, 2015. Amman, Jordan: ICARDA.



This document is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Unless otherwise noted, you are free to copy, duplicate, or reproduce and distribute, display, or transmit any part of this publication or portions thereof without permission, and to make translations, adaptations, or other derivative works under the following conditions:



ATTRIBUTION. The work must be attributed, but not in any way that suggests endorsement by the publisher or the author(s).

Table of Contents

Preamble	3
A. Overall Response to the Evaluation	3
B. Response to Report Recommendations	3
C. Detailed responses recommendation by recommendation	4
Relevance	4
Recommendation 1:	4
Recommendation 2:	5
Effectiveness, impact and sustainability	6
Recommendation 3:	7
Recommendation 4:	8
Recommendation 5:	9
Recommendation 6:	9
Quality of science	10
Recommendation 7:	11
Recommendation 8:	12
Recommendation 9:	13
Recommendation 10:	14
Efficiency: Governance and institutional arrangements	15
Recommendation 11:	15
Future Directions	17
Recommendation 12:	17
Recommendation 13:	18
D. Action Plan and Timetable	20

Preamble

The management team of the CGIAR Research Program (CRP) on Dryland Systems welcomes the opportunity to respond to the CRP-commissioned external evaluation (CCEE) of the program. The CCEE final report (one main report, and one volume of annexes) was presented on October 27, 2015 to the CCEE Oversight Committee, the CRP Director and the IEA. The CRP Director prepared this response to be approved by the Chair of Dryland Systems Independent Steering Committee (ISPC) and the Board of Trustees (BOT) of the Lead Centre (ICARDA).

The Management Response (the present document) has been prepared through a consultative process involving the ISC, Flagship Projects and Cross-Cutting Themes coordinators, Senior Leaderships of CGIAR Centres and program partners under the guidance of the CRP Director.

A. Overall Response to the Evaluation

The oversight committee is of the opinion that the report reflects the achievements and status of the drylands CRP realistically and provides a useful forward looking perspective and recommendations on what the CRP might consider achievable in the period that remains. The committee appreciates the balanced nature of the analysis which considered the events in the early stages of the CRP establishment that coincided with the evacuation of the lead center from its headquarters in Aleppo, Syria as a result of civil war, and describes and reviews the remedial action taken by the lead centre and the achievements up until June 2015. In particular, the committee appreciates the constructive and forward-looking approach that has been taken in the evaluation. The executive summary is well written and summarizes the chapters. Chapter 1- Introduction to the evaluation has an excellent explanation of the context of the evaluation and approach taken. Good use is made of annexes to provide more details. Chapter 2 - The CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Systems is well structured and consists of well interconnected sections: A well written and useful summary of the context of drylands research and of the CGIAR CRP's; a realistic and well balanced review the evolution of the CRP 1.1; a review of CRP and bilateral funding; a well done and useful review of the drylands flagships, their implementation and the proposed new flagships. Chapters 3 on Relevance and 4 on Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability are well-written chapters, which make a distinction between supply and demand relevance, and has a section that provides a useful review of the theory of change, impact pathways and achieved impacts of the drylands CRP. The CCEE rightfully notices that while many impacts are socio-economic in nature there is limited capacity to support research in this area given the fact that staff composition favours biophysical dimensions. This analysis results in a set of recommendations. Chapter 5 - Quality Science reviews staff qualifications, systems conceptual framework, publications and research design. Chapter 6 Effectiveness and Efficiency: governance and management analyses governance, financial management, HR management, M&E and reporting, performance of lead centre and other centres. Together these observations result in five recommendations, of which four are addressed to the CO. Chapter 7 - Future Directions is looking forward and reviewing what could be done in 2015 and 2016 (maximizing value, spending resources on synthesis and communication rather than one more year of field based research) and what systems research could be done in the context of the future drylands research.

B. Response to Report Recommendations

Overall the CRP-DS accepts most of the recommendations with the rider that in effect the program has only been operating since 2013 and systems research usually takes a much longer 'incubation' time compared with other aspects of the CGIAR's research portfolio. We believe it is indeed unfortunate the events within the reform process of the CGIAR will not allow the CRP to

advance in its current form but we look forward to building the systems research into whatever new formulation there is that focuses on agri-food systems for drylands.

C. Detailed responses recommendation by recommendation

In the remaining part of this section we summarize the overall conclusion of the CCEE for each of the main evaluation questions, address in detail the 13 recommendations as presented in the evaluation, explain how the Dryland Systems CRP plans to respond during its remaining life (short to medium term, i.e. to end of 2016), and how the Dryland Systems CRP believes the proposed new CRP, Dryland Cereals and Legumes Agri-food Systems (DCLAS) should respond (long term, 2017 and beyond). Regarding the latter, the Dryland Systems CRP leadership is participating actively in developing the proposed DCLAS CRP, but it cannot speak for the leadership of that Program. Therefore, in our responses below we state what actions, if any, we propose in the longer term be considered as recommendations to the DCLAS partnership.

Relevance

Overall Conclusion of the CCEE

The CCEE concludes that overall that the CRP on Dryland Systems is highly relevant. There is a clear need for investing in improving sustainable productivity of dryland agricultural systems, which would benefit hundreds of millions of poor people. The rationale for this CRP is very clear and difficult to dispute. The CROP on Dryland Systems is well aligned with both the previous CGIAR SLOs and the new ones, and is also reasonably well aligned with the IDOs. However, more attention could be paid to improving nutrition of rural households in the drylands.

The CCEE finds that the CRP has strong partnerships at regional Flagship and national levels with NARS, universities, NGOs, CBOs, and farmers. The working relationships among the Centres at regional Flagship level vary, but in most cases we observed they are not as well integrated as would be expected. Several factors underlay this fragmentation: insufficient W1 and W2 funds, dependence on Centre-led bilateral projects, and budget holders are Centre- not CRP-based. The incentive structure does not encourage inter-Centre collaboration at present.

While there are also good partnerships with ARIs working on dryland agricultural systems, the CCEE concludes that there is great potential for effectively working with more ARI partners. The CGIAR Centres working on dryland agricultural systems have a substantial comparative advantage in terms of their decades of experience working in the field and with local and national partners, but could complement this through partnering with institutions having advanced modelling and data analysis capacities.

The CCEE has made two recommendations for strengthening the relevance of Dryland Systems research.

Recommendation 1:

Pay more attention to food access and improved nutrition.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems CRP and DCLAS leadership.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE notes that the new CGIAR Strategic Results Framework gives a high priority to improving nutrition and health outcomes (CGIAR 2015). At an aggregate level it appears Dryland Systems reflects both the previous and new SLO priorities. However, food access, which reflects numbers of households having improved their dietary scores after dissemination and adoption of

program outputs, has relatively limited mapped resources across all Dryland Systems regions. Systems thinking – which considers the integration of multiple cropping and livestock productions systems – is not broadly considered in the single commodity focussed CGIAR and has the potential to manage fluctuations in available nutrition. The CCEE understands improving nutrition will be given greater emphasis in the proposed new DCLAS CRP.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

While the Dryland Systems CRP agrees with this recommendation, the limited remaining time for this program combined with the anticipated reduction in Windows 1&2 resources will limit our ability to respond during 2016. If sufficient resources are available, the CRP will endeavour to collect and synthesize existing data on access to food and nutritional status in the dryland areas where we work and publish a working paper as well as any data sets we find. These can provide a foundation for future work.

Longer-term actions (DCLAS)

Assuming that the partners are requested to develop a full proposal for DCLAS, we will endeavour to ensure that research on access to food and nutrition, especially for women and children, is given high priority on the new CRP. We will explore creating partnerships with both advanced research institutes and developing country institutions with expertise in nutrition issues in developing countries; and will build into the program specific studies aimed at identifying ways to enable families to achieve full food security, including home gardens, communal gardens, and market-based solutions. Such an effort will be reinforced by a focus on the improvement of legumes in the proposed DCLAS-CRP.

Recommendation 2:

Take the initiative to facilitate and catalyse stronger partnerships linking Advanced Research Institutions (ARIs) in dryland systems research and capacity development with national institutions in developing countries.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems CRP and DCLAS leadership.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE found that while there are some linkages and examples of collaboration of the CRP with ARIs, they are not adequate to achieve strong synergies between the strengths of the CGIAR Centres and those of advanced research institutions. An example of a way forward is to co-supervise Ph.D. students and postdoctoral fellows to do field research in collaboration with CGIAR scientists but drawing on the expertise of the ARI scientists as well. Another possibility is to prepare joint research and capacity development proposals and seek funding from new donors that already support the ARIs’ work. The proposed new DCLAS CRP should build on this initiative and develop strong ARI-CGIAR partnerships for dryland research.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

The Dryland Systems CRP will respond to this recommendation in the context of attempting to implement recommendation 7, which calls for focusing on producing a body of high-quality scientific publications during the final year of the Program. We will reach out to ARI scientists to participate in this work.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

We agree with the CCEE on the importance of partnerships with ARIs, and linking them to developing country partners. We agree with the specific actions suggested, for example co-supervising postgraduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and collaborating with ARI's in preparing joint proposals aimed at donors to which CGIAR centres do not usually have access. We will work with the DCLAS partners to endeavour to ensure that the anticipated full proposal includes strong ARI partnerships. That said, given limited funding, it will be critical to collaborate with partner ARIs to prepare Window 3 and bilateral proposals aimed at new donors in order to fully implement this recommendation.

Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

Overall conclusion of the CCEE

The ISPC has consistently criticised the Dryland Systems CRP Theory of Change. The CCEE agrees with the ISPC, but it also finds that the CRP has made significant progress in developing its Theory of Change and impact pathway framework since the Extension Proposal was prepared. Nevertheless, the current impact pathway remains too generic and abstract, and key assumptions are not spelled out. In addition, the key stakeholders who must make the changes (outcomes) needed to achieve long-term impacts and their roles and linkages are not clearly identified. The current impact pathway has been developed largely from the top down (with consultation with some scientists); it has not been developed through a participatory bottom-up process with clients and partners. There is no evidence that the impact pathways developed in the regions are used as research management tools; they appear to have been developed to meet the requirement to have an impact pathway. The regional Flagship Programs have articulated a number of ambitious impact targets, which, while laudable, are not linked to the impact pathway.

The CRP claims to be having important field-level impacts. This is commendable, but there is a need to document these, supported with hard evidence and a plausible theory of change; and published in both CRP-branded and peer-reviewed outlets. This would be an important contribution as there are only limited documented impact success stories from drylands.

The CCEE reviewed three crosscutting themes besides partnership that was discussed previously: Gender and Youth, Communication, and Capacity Development. *In all three themes, the CCEE commends the recent progress made, after a somewhat slow start.* The CRP has developed high-quality strategy papers for gender, youth, and capacity development. It has recently initiated efforts to become more effective in communicating the findings, outputs, and impacts of the CRP outside the CRP. However, there is little progress to date on the use of tools to enhance internal communications and the creation of a culture of knowledge sharing among scientists.

There is a gap between the progress at central level on gender, youth and capacity development, and the activities observed in the field. This reflects the unfortunate timing of the strategy development, which has lagged behind the planning of the field research. Therefore, in the field, there is very little work underway specifically aimed at youth; and while there is important work being done on gender, it is not at the core of the field research and is not likely to lead to major impacts. This work is also hampered by the weak social science capacity at field level. The capacity development work in the field sites as reported in the Annual Reports is significant but largely traditional in nature and is not based on the Capacity Development Strategy – again reflecting the late development of the Strategy.

Finally, the CCEE cannot come to a firm conclusion regarding the sustainability of the innovations emerging from the CRP research. There are clearly important institutional and technical

innovations being tested and implemented, and there are indications that some of these may be sustained and scaled out further. On the other hand, the weak engagement with policy makers observed during the field visits may limit the potential for scaling up. While the CCEE understands baseline surveys have been done in all the Action Sites, there is no indication of plans for *ex ante* or *ex post* impact evaluations during the final year of the program. The CCEE believes such studies should be given priority if possible in a difficult budgeting environment.

The CCEE makes the following recommendations on effectiveness, aimed at both the leadership of Dryland Systems as well as the leadership of DCLAS.

Recommendation 3:

Develop a practical, credible and useful theory of change and associated impact pathway for the remaining period of Dryland Systems and, more important, for DCLAS.

Addressed to: DCLAS leadership with support from Dryland Systems

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE states that the current Theory of Change (ToC) and impact pathways for the Dryland Systems CRP and the proposed DCLAS CRP remain as works in progress. The CCEE suggests that the Dryland Systems leadership collaborate with the leadership of DCLAS and follow these steps to develop an improved ToC:

- 1) RMC and IRTs to promote workshops with key stakeholders in each of the planned research field sites to develop realistic impact pathways that include specification of key stakeholders and their roles, power relationships, and potential entry points for change.
- 2) Provide hands-on training to scientists in how to use a theory of change to plan and monitor implementation of research *in development*.
- 3) Using regional meetings and Innovation Platforms activities to build on these localized impact pathways to produce a generic CRP-level impact pathway.
- 4) Build the impact pathways into the MEL system so that that system becomes a mechanism for tracking progress toward outcomes, including the capacity to adjust the theory of change and impact pathways based on lessons from experience.

In essence, the CCEE suggests that more needs to be done in terms of defining the logical path from research to outcomes to impacts, particularly specifying and quantifying credible assumptions and hypotheses across discovery, proof of concept, piloting and out-scaling phases. This should include specification of the roles of various stakeholders, and which stakeholders must make what changes in their behaviour based on new knowledge, attitudes and skills emerging from the research activities.

As the SDGs have now been formally endorsed, the CCEE suggests that the Dryland Systems and the new DCLAS CRP team should establish a credible logical frame as soon as possible.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We note that, as acknowledged by the CCEE, we have made substantial progress during 2015 in strengthening our ToC and impact pathways. We have adopted what we regard as an agent-focused approach and have integrated livelihoods as well as gender and youth considerations into our theory; and we have refined the CRP’s impact pathway accordingly. The revised impact pathway is now used as a management tool to a greater extent than had been the case. We have

taken steps to integrate the revised ToC and impact pathways into our Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system. Although we agree with the CCEE that a more bottom-up participatory approach to developing Program impact pathways is desirable, there will not be sufficient time or resources to implement this in the remaining year of the Program.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

The Dryland Systems CRP leadership fully endorses the bottom-up participatory approach to developing Program impact pathways and will encourage the DCLAS leadership to adopt this approach. We are adapting our MEL system for use by DCLAS, which will include a more relevant, and useful ToC and set of impact pathways adapted to the various research sites and Agricultural Livelihood Systems (ALS) where we propose to work.

Recommendation 4:

Carry out and publish credible impact assessments, and produce documentation for advocacy.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

Notwithstanding the limitations of the current theory of change, and short remaining life of the CRP, the CCEE states that Dryland Systems needs to be commended for its achievements to date. A number of achievements have been noted in annual reporting for 2013 and 2014, although attribution to the CRP versus legacy projects is unclear. The CRP should document these achievements through *ex ante* and *ex post* evaluations and presented in both branded and peer reviewed publications and widely disseminated. A review of evidence on the impacts of CGIAR research published since 2000 suggests that currently there are limited examples of dryland success stories.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We believe it is premature to implement credible *ex post facto* impact assessments, given the short period in which this CRP has been operating. However, we propose to identify a limited set of promising research-based innovations attributable to the Dryland Systems CRP (including its constituent Windows 3 and bilateral projects) and carry out *ex ante* impact assessments, including an attempt to document the costs and both existing and potential future benefit streams, and to identify the distribution of these costs and benefits (i.e. who pays and who actually benefits). This work will be published and will provide a basis for future *ex post facto* impact assessments. How many we will be able to implement will be dictated by the available resources.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

We agree with the CCEE conclusion that there have been insufficient studies documenting impacts of agricultural technical, policy and institutional innovations in the drylands. We anticipate that work on some promising dryland agricultural system innovations begun during this CRP will continue under DCLAS. We will encourage the DCLAS leadership to design the Program in a way that will facilitate future impact assessments, for example by building key indicators into the MEL system. We will also encourage DCLAS to carry out *ex ante* assessments in its early years, and plan for implementing *ex post facto* assessments of innovations emerging from Dryland Systems in the future.

Recommendation 5:

Produce and disseminate a wide range of media that communicate the main findings and state-of-knowledge on dryland systems, the lessons learned, material that can be used for training/ capacity development, etc.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

This recommendation is intended to support Recommendation number 7 to focus on producing excellent state-of-the-art scientific outputs. The CCEE has suggested that when people look back on the experience of the Dryland Systems CRP, they should see the real value added of its work rather than recalling the problems it faced in its early phases.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

Since 2014, we have engaged a full-time communication specialist and have strengthened our communications program, as is acknowledged by the CCEE. This recommendation is linked directly to supporting implementation of Recommendation number 7, which is the recommendation given highest priority, by the CCEE. Within the anticipated severe budget constraints in 2016, we will do our best to fully implement this recommendation.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

This recommendation is specifically aimed at the final year of the Dryland Systems CRP. However, we agree that the proposed DCLAS CRP should have a strong communications program fully integrated into and supporting the research implementation process.

Recommendation 6:

Promote a strong culture of internal knowledge sharing and communication as integral to the entire research process. A possible specific action to achieve this is to establish a mechanism for sharing draft papers and encouraging informal peer reviews, perhaps through the MEL system.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE states that this would help reduce the current perceived lack of sharing of experiences and lessons, for example among regional Flagships. Successful integration of knowledge sharing and regular communication will require a continuous effort from management. It will also require resources to be allocated based on a specific plan and enhanced human resources with communications and knowledge management skills. Other CRPs (e.g. CCAFS, WLE) may provide a model for this. The CCEE refers to a recent paper suggesting action is needed to strengthen the capacity of scientists as peer reviewers and even recommends accreditation of peer reviewers. The recommendation specifically proposes implementing an on-line system for sharing and peer reviewing draft papers through the MEL.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We agree on the importance of promoting a strong culture of knowledge sharing and communication internally as well as externally, and agree the CRP could have done more on this. During the short period remaining, it will not be possible to make major investments in promoting culture change. However, we propose to implement the idea of creating an on-line space for sharing and peer reviewing draft papers and more generally for sharing ideas. We also intend subject to available resources, to organize topic-specific write shops that will bring CRP scientists together to prepare peer-reviewed publications and books. Additional external funding has already been secured to initiate one write shop.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

The proposal for DCLAS includes significant investments in communication and knowledge sharing. In response to this recommendation from the CCEE, we will encourage the leadership of DCLAS to include adequate resources for promoting the tools needed as well as the underlying culture for sharing knowledge among the various partners; and we will encourage the inclusion and strengthening of the knowledge sharing space within the MEL system.

Quality of Science

Overall conclusion of the CCEE

The CCEE acknowledges that given the late start of the Dryland Systems CRP, it is premature to arrive at definitive conclusions regarding the quality of the research to date. Many of the published outputs are the products of legacy projects mapped to the CRP and reflect centre mandates rather than the CRP mandate. Overall, as would be expected within the CGIAR, most of the scientists working on the CRP are experienced professionals; 75% have six or more years of experience. Most of the scientists have biophysical disciplinary training; there are very few social scientists and economists (and those working on the CRP are mostly junior). This is a major weakness in the Program, especially at regional Flagship and field levels. In addition, while the CGIAR scientists are generally well trained in their discipline, there are very few with training in systems research. Indeed, demand was expressed for more training in systems work. Their time allocations are highly fragmented: most spend 20% or less of their time on this CRP, which undoubtedly has an impact on productivity.

The CCEE states that the CRP through its various proposals and reports has expressed a fairly consistent and quite reasonable, if limited, concept of what is meant by “systems research”. However, there is less clarity on how “dryland (agricultural) systems” are defined. Some gaps in conceptualization were also noted. For example, there could be stronger links to an existing “Dryland Development Paradigm”; stronger links could be established between the local systems under study and global systems research; and more attention could be paid to non-agricultural livelihoods, rural-urban linkages, food systems, and policy. The CCEE notes that currently efforts are being made to conceptually integrate “agricultural systems” and “livelihood systems”. This is an important development though still a work in progress.

The CCEE examined the journal articles mapped to the CRP, as contained in a recent published list (Dryland Systems 2015a). The CCEE found that 55, i.e. about 63%, of these are published in journals with an ISI factor. About 60% are open-access and 35% were classified as “systems” or at least “multi-disciplinary”. The CCEE noted the low or at best modest productivity of published journal articles per FTE scientist, though this depends on the assumptions made. None of the papers published so far are comparative cross-ALS or cross-Flagship studies, reflecting the absence of a global program until 2015. Overall, the papers reviewed were fairly good and a few were excellent.

As is the case for all CRPs, Dryland Systems has no quality control procedures of its own for ensuring the quality of the research and publications, It relies entirely on the procedures of the partner institutions. These are probably adequate (though there are differences among Centres) and this state of affairs reflects the current CGIAR structure. Nevertheless, the CCEE concludes that the CRP should also have mechanisms in place to ensure publications based on work it supports is of high quality and reflects a systems perspective. This seems especially important given that quality of science of CRPs is one of the metrics used for performance assessment.

In terms of overall research program design, the CCEE notes that there was no global program until 2015 (and it has some limitations, for example, aside from gender, limited social science and economics expertise). Over time, the Strategic Research Themes and more recently the ALSs have been moving targets, as they seem to evolve rapidly; however the regional Flagships and Action Sites have remained fixed. The CCEE found that there seems to be a disconnection between the work at the Action Sites and the global level program: the fieldwork at best only partly reflects the “systems” concepts and priorities described at the programmatic level. Much though not all of the field level research is classic testing of alternative crop varieties or management practices. Most of the field research is done in partnership with farmers and various local partners, reflecting a strong participatory approach. Finally the CCEE noted that funds are dispersed rather thinly among many small activities, not strategically focused to produce results.

Recommendation 7:

To maximize its value, during the final year of the Dryland Systems CRP the Program should consolidate its activities and focus most of its resources on producing a body of excellent scientific outputs that define the state of knowledge and provide clear directions for the next phase of research in development on dryland systems. The CRP should draw on outside expertise to complement CGIAR expertise in this endeavour. As part of this effort, the CRP should also undertake a systematic review of literature to make the case for drylands research and investments.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE considers this to be its highest priority recommendation, especially in view of the limited resources available. The CCEE states that plans for 2016 should include specific publication plans and W1&2 resources should be focused primarily on producing these outputs. This applies mainly to scientific outputs but should be complemented using other kinds of communication media to share results widely (see Recommendation 5). During the final year of the program, the main focus should be on producing a set of branded excellent outputs that reflect the state of the art in dryland systems research and identify the priority research areas for the future. These should build on work done at flagship levels, but the CRP should also reach out to other professionals with recognized expertise to collaborate in this endeavour. The Task Force could play a significant role in this endeavour. Organizing a series of professionally facilitated workshops would be a productive mechanism for producing these products.

The ISPC noted that the ‘must have’ of discussing dryland research priorities and how they affect new initiatives was not being met. This includes gap identification and identification of key partnerships. As part of this recommendation the CCEE recommends that the case for drylands be stated in a peer-reviewed review document, along with mapping of research activities and

identification of key gaps. The case should be structured around major SLOs of poverty, malnutrition and natural resource management. The assembled evidence base for the drylands systems case is currently very limited. The CCEE noted that there are sources of data that could be tapped, for example UNCCD data, better data on the number of poor people mapped by aridity levels, and ICRISAT data on malnutrition. ICARDA also has significant capacity for this kind of analysis. These types of gaps need to be captured and mapped in the analysis of historical rates of adoption of improved germplasm and farming practices in drylands and more productive areas. Malnutrition is also a major issue for the drylands. No documentation systematically collates health surveys and child nutrition indicators by aridity to demonstrate the magnitude of this issue (see our response to Recommendation 1, above).

The CCEE concludes that drylands constitute a significant area, which the CGIAR-inspired Green Revolution has missed. It should now be the first region targeted in any CGIAR-wide initiative.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We agree entirely with the CCEE that the CGIAR-inspired Green Revolution has essentially bypassed the drylands, and that drylands ought to be given an extremely high priority by the CGIAR. We also agree that between the work done to date by the Dryland Systems CRP and the long-standing work by the CRP partners and others, there are significant databases and sources of information that can be analysed and synthesized. This work can produce a very important global public good, i.e. the state-of-the-art of knowledge on dryland agricultural systems performance and trends, which would also identify future research questions, opportunities and priorities. Therefore, we fully endorse this recommendation and plan to implement it as fully as possible within the limited resources likely to be available (see response to Recommendation 6 above). This will include preparing a peer-reviewed publication making the case for dryland agricultural systems research linked to the CGIAR Strategic Research Framework. We will create a task force of leading scientists from within the CRP partners and from other institutions to plan and lead this work.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

This recommendation is aimed largely at the Dryland Systems CRP during the short to medium term. However, the work to be carried out will be used in designing the proposed DCLAS CRP, and if necessary the final results will be published jointly with DCLAS.

Recommendation 8:

Invest in agreeing on a shared understanding of “agricultural systems” that integrates “livelihood systems”, and what is the role and value of “systems research”, and invest in training researchers in systems science.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU, perhaps in cooperation with the Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS) and Humid Tropics CRPs and/or with DCLAS.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE states that at the moment there is no common understanding of “systems research” within either the Dryland Systems CRP or more broadly, the CGIAR, and most conceptualizations are dominated by biophysical models. The CRP is currently working on elaborating a more coherent agricultural livelihood systems framework, which the CCEE commends. The CCEE believes the systems CRPs should take the initiative to support the CGIAR in developing and disseminating its own model(s) of what it means by “systems research”, what the role of systems

research is in relation to other agricultural, policy and NRM research, what the overall goals and objectives of systems research will be, and establish how it will measure progress and success. The CGIAR conceptualization should integrate people and livelihoods, which will also require an investment in impact assessment methodologies specific to systems research, as the traditional methodologies focused on returns to investments in commodities are not relevant for NRM, policy, or systems research. It will also require strengthening social science research capacity.

This recommendation is closely linked to Recommendation 3, i.e. developing a more credible theory of change and impact pathway. While we accept that the “systems” CRPs could have done more to develop a shared agricultural systems conceptual framework and linking this to more effective theories of change, we believe that more has been done than is acknowledged by the CCEE. For example CRP-DS participation and contribution to the systems conference organized at IITA by the three systems CRPs in March 2015. We have since submitted a proposal for a Bellagio conference to the Rockefeller Foundation on systems approaches.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We propose to consult with the leadership of the Humid Tropics and AAS CRPs to ascertain their interest in collaborating on a modest project to examine how to integrate our respective systems conceptual frameworks into a shared framework. We will also explore including the leadership not only of DCLAS but other planned future CRPs having a systems flagship. If there is sufficient interest and resources, we propose to organize a write-shop and develop a joint paper articulating this shared vision.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

To a large extent, this will depend on how systems research is to be incorporated into the new CRP portfolio.

Recommendation 9:

The socio-economic components of systems research should be strengthened with poverty and livelihood assessments, adoption studies, policy and institutional analyses, and in-depth gender and youth studies. This will require recruitment of social and economic science and systems expertise.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems PMU using consultants; and DCLAS leadership for the future.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE states that while bio-physical research is a key strength of the program, it needs to be complemented by stronger socio-economic capacity. The field visits and review of published papers demonstrated that institutional, social and economic scientific research capacity is weak, and there are numerous missed opportunities for achieving deeper insights and more effective impacts. This recommendation applies to the current CRP and to the proposed future DCLAS CRP.

We agree with the recommendation that socio-economic sciences need to be strengthened if we are to ensure that systems research leads to a full understanding of dryland agricultural systems, and identifies real opportunities to improve the incomes, food security, nutritional status and well-being of all rural dryland people.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

With only one year remaining in the CRP, and the anticipated highly constrained resources, we will not be able to take any substantial action to implement this recommendation in the short to medium term. We will explore whether we can make better use of existing social and economic science expertise within the partner Centres in order to implement Recommendation 7 (producing high quality science products). If resources permit we will also explore the limited use of social science consultants in this work.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

We will encourage and advocate for strengthening economic and social science in the proposed DCLAS.

Recommendation 10:

Strengthen the accountability of the CRP for the quality of science produced.

Addressed to: Dryland Systems Director should initiate, in consultation with other CRP Directors and the CO

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE notes that a major metric used to assess CRP performance is quality of science; therefore the CRP leadership should have a clear role. The CCEE also acknowledges that implementing this recommendation may require support from the Consortium Office to establish the authority of the CRP leadership to set and enforce quality standards in consultation with partner Centres. The importance of producing developmental outcomes and impacts does not free CGIAR scientists from the obligation to produce excellent science. The CCEE proposes that the CRP’s PMU should play a stronger role in setting standards and ensuring standards are met in terms of open access, correct acknowledgements and attribution, and fair authorship. This role should be supported by guidelines from the CO applicable to all CRPs. The CCEE recognizes this problem may be difficult to solve with the existing structure in which 15 independent Centres share responsibility for the performance of the entire CGIAR system; a more radical solution that could be considered is for the CO to hire CRP Directors and PMUs, and contract with the Centres for implementation.

This recommendation is controversial and is not accepted by some of the CRP partners’ research leadership. Nevertheless, we agree there is a problem here: if CRP performance is to be assessed in part based on the quality and quantity of science outputs, it seems logical the CRP leadership should have a significant role in setting and enforcing quality standards.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We will request clarification on this with the Consortium Office.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

As part of the process of developing the full DCLAS proposal, we will explore options to a) establish clear guidelines for attributing publications to the CRP; b) include specific publication plans in work plans; and c) enable the CRP leadership to review publications attributed to the CRP.

Efficiency: Governance and institutional arrangements

Overall conclusion of the CCEE

The CCEE concluded that the current governance structure and management processes are largely suitable for effectively implementing the CRP. The TORs are consistent with the governance structure mandated by the FC and CB for all CRPs. The CRP has adopted the recommendations of the IAU on governance and management, for which the CCEE commends the Program management. The Lead Centre (ICARDA) has responded positively to the IAU recommendations, especially commendable given the circumstances of having to leave its headquarters. Earlier recruitment of the PMU would have precluded many of the problems the CRP has faced.

The IAU had made a number of recommendations to the Consortium Office that would facilitate more effective management of CRPs. The CCEE agrees with the IAU that clearer guidelines and harmonized templates for planning and reporting would be very useful and has made a recommendation in this area.

The CRP has faced large reductions in its W1&2 funds for 2015 – larger than any other CRP. These have come right at the time the CRP has developed a more coherent program with strong governance and management arrangements. The CCEE does not understand the rationale for such drastic W1&2 cuts. These cuts have severely affected the CRP's capacity to achieve all its planned outputs and outcomes. W3 and bilateral funding are also slightly lower than expected. The CRP has responded by consolidating field sites and reducing the number of planned deliverables. Nevertheless, there is a need for further strategic consolidation and focus to ensure the CRP produces excellent outputs with its diminished resources. A more vigorous advocacy program linked to an active resource mobilisation strategy is also needed.

Regarding human resources management, the CCEE found that there are problems recruiting good scientists given the difficult locations where the Program works. There are approximately 141 full time equivalent scientists, many of whom are nationally recruited. Only about 22% are women. The PMU is staffed by well-qualified professionals. In Chapter 5 the CCEE has noted that especially at Flagship levels, the CRP is very weak in terms of social and systems sciences.

Finally, the CCEE commends the forward-looking, innovative and functional Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system that has been developed and implemented. It supports learning lessons as well as more traditional M&E, and other CRPs are either adopting it or adapting it to their needs.

The CCEE made no recommendations to the CRP on this topic. However, it has made one recommendation addressed to the CGIAR Consortium Office.

Recommendation 11:

The Consortium Office should develop and adopt clearer management guidelines and harmonize templates for planning and reporting to streamline CRP management processes. Four specific improvements are:

- a. The CO should develop guidelines for mapping Windows 3 and bilateral projects and for cost sharing.*

- b. The CO should review and clarify CRP Directors' authority for the new round of CRPs.*
- c. The CO should develop standardised management costing guidelines.*
- d. The CO should consider harmonising the templates for the POWB and for Annual Reporting, as well as OCS and the use of a common space to make published outputs available (for example, CGSpace).*

Addressed to: CGIAR Consortium Office.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

- a. Guidelines for mapping Windows 3 and bilateral projects and for cost sharing*

In response to the IAU's criticism of current mapping processes, the CRP agreed to develop bilateral projects guidelines. They have been drafted and circulated to the RMC as requested during the 2nd RMC meeting. They were submitted to the 2015 ISC for approval. However, they were developed in the absence of CO guidance. The CCEE believes the CO should lead this guidance and organize an on-line data base to enhance transparency.

- b. Review and clarify CRP Directors' authority for the new round of CRPs*

The CCEE stated that it is not clear that the CRP Director has sufficient authority to change resourcing to Centres based on performance. The PMU has initiated six-monthly performance reviews and claims re-allocations are possible but the CCEE is not convinced. The IEA governance review found only five of 15 CRP leaders agreed that they have adequate authority to manage and lead the CRP and recommended changes in research priorities to achieve desired results so this issue is not limited to this CRP. The CCEE also feels the CRP Director should have more authority for controlling quality of published outputs (Recommendation 10). The CO should review governance guidelines to support program director authority in shaping direction and delivering results. A more radical approach could also be considered: hiring of CRP Directors and PMU members by the CO itself, and contracting research services to the Centres.

- c. Develop standardised management costing guidelines*

The CCEE found that CRP management costs are difficult to compare across CRPs as there are considerable differences in the manner in which administrative support services are handled and reported, and centres charge overhead to the CRPs as well as direct expenses for specific services and positions. The CO should develop clear costing guidelines and issue them as part of the guidelines for developing full CRP proposals for the next phase

- d. Harmonise the templates for the POWB and for Annual Reporting, as well as OCS and the use of a common space to make published outputs available*

The CCEE suggests this would make assessing performance vis-à-vis plans easier, and standardize financial and output reporting in an open and transparent manner. In addition the CGIAR should re-evaluate the performance indicators used, to achieve a better balance between development and science achievements. Adoption of this idea could enhance the potential for monitoring performance and ensuring that the CGIAR focus remains on doing excellent science that is aimed at achieving the development goals as articulated in the SLOs and IDOs. The CCEE is concerned that the over-emphasis on development performance indicators sets up stronger incentives for doing development and not science.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

None. This recommendation is aimed at the Consortium Office.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

None. This recommendation is aimed at the Consortium Office.

Future Directions

Overall conclusion of the CCEE

The CCEE observes that the proposed new CRP landscape no longer includes systems CRPs operating separately from commodity CRPs; rather, there is an attempt to integrate systems and commodities research. For drylands, the current Dryland Systems, Dryland Cereals, and Grain Legumes CRPs would be merged into one CRP, to be called CGIAR Research Program 1, *Dryland Cereals and Legumes Agri-food Systems* (DCLAS). The CCEE has examined the pre-proposal submitted in July 2015. It commends the inclusion of a systems flagship focused on people's livelihoods. However, the CCEE suggests that as currently written, the pre-proposal gives the impression of fragmentation of the components (flagships) of the proposed CRP; there is no holistic integrated "systems" perspective but rather a narrower commercial agricultural production perspective. Approaches that have worked in now-developed but formerly pioneer drylands such as in the USA and Australia will not necessarily work well in the very different contexts of developing country drylands. A livelihoods perspective rooted in a holistic integrated vision linking socio-economics and agro-ecologies should be the driving force of the CRP. This livelihoods perspective should have as its central driver finding opportunities for women and youth to thrive along with men by creating multiple livelihood options. To be successful, the CRP team should include strong systems scientists and senior social and economic scientists with excellent gender credentials.

While the priority given to South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa based on poverty levels is logical and understandable, the CCEE is concerned that insufficient priority will be given to North Africa and Western and Central Asian dryland systems. While these regions may have lower numbers of very poor people, they have high numbers of unemployed rural youth, and are areas that exhibit high levels of social stress and political insecurity which have impacts that extend beyond the region. Agriculture remains an important sector for creating more employment opportunities for young women and men. The CGIAR should retain a strong focus on these regions.

Finally, the CCEE observes that the process of creating and planning the new CRPs seems to be driven from the top, i.e. from the levels of the CO, FC, ISPC and donors. This observation also applies to their governance: they are dominated by the priorities and interests of the CGIAR Centres, not those of their clients. The CGIAR programs ought to move toward being driven by the priorities and interests of their main partners, i.e. NARS, NGO and CBO partners.

Although the CCEE recognizes it may be going beyond its TOR, nevertheless, it makes two recommendations regarding the next phase of CRPs.

Recommendation 12:

A holistic integrated systems vision linking socio-economics and agro-ecologies should be the driving force of the DCLAS CRP. This livelihoods perspective should focus on promoting positive systemic change, and have as its central driver finding opportunities for women and youth to thrive along with men by creating multiple livelihood options.

Addressed to: DCLAS CRP leadership.

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE notes that the DCLAS pre-proposal includes a strongly stated “Cluster of Activities” within Flagship 1 on “Empowering Women and Young People through Inclusive Innovation Systems”. However, the CCEE is not convinced that designating gender and youth as “Cluster of Activities” within Flagship 1 is adequate. Therefore, this recommendation could be made the central focus of the proposed Flagship on “Improved Rural Livelihood Systems” as described in the draft pre-proposal. Impacts are fostered through partnerships; therefore gender and youth mainstreaming must be integrated with capacity development, partnership, and communication strategy. To be successful, it will be important to include in the CRP team social and systems scientists with excellent gender credentials.

We observe that there is an important conceptual issue at stake. The DCLAS pre-proposal is based on a commercial value chain theory of change that is drawn from the private sector and has been integrated into the Dryland Cereals CRP. The CCEE suggests this theory of change may be inadequate to ensure that poor rural people, including women and youth, achieve higher levels of well-being, food security and nutritional status. It proposes instead “a livelihoods perspective rooted in a holistic integrated vision linking socio-economics and agro-ecologies” as the driving force. We believe this issue needs further analysis and discussion, and will advocate for an overall theory of change that integrates both commercial value chain and livelihoods perspectives.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

We will advocate for a more balanced theory of change as the DCLAS driving force that integrates both the commercial value chain and gender- and youth-focused livelihoods perspectives.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

These actions will be taken on-board by the DCLAS leadership once the CRP Portfolio is finalized.

Recommendation 13:

The design and governance of all the new CRPs should be based on clear demand from developing country clients and partners, and they should play a far stronger role in this process than is currently the case.

Addressed to: CGIAR

Key Elements (“must have’s”)

The CCEE states that at the moment, the process of designing the new CRPs appears to be driven by the priorities and mandates of the CGIAR Centres, ISPC, CO and donors. Their governance processes as they have evolved during the current CRP phase are also dominated by the CGIAR Centres. To be really effective and responsive to the needs of the rural poor, it is critically important to make the CGIAR program more demand-driven and to empower national partners and clients.

The Dryland Systems CRP concurs with this assessment and advocates a more bottom-up demand-driven and participatory process for designing CGIAR Research Programs. We however recognize this recommendation has implications in terms of resources and time.

Short-to-medium term actions (2016)

This recommendation is aimed at the CGIAR. However, in developing the DCLAS full proposal, we will advocate for as participatory and demand-driven process as is possible within limited time and resources. We would strongly favour allocation of more resources to enable implementation of this recommendation.

Longer-term actions (2nd phase)

Not applicable

D. Action Plan and Timetable

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
1. <i>Pay more attention to food access and improved nutrition</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u> .	1.a Collate and synthesize data on access to food and nutrition status in drylands in a working paper	Dryland Systems PMU and participant centers e.g. Bioversity	By end of 2016	Yes
		1.b Establish partnerships with ARIs and others with nutrition expertise	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	Partnerships established during 2016	Will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
		1.c Studies on ways to improve food security & nutrition in drylands through system research	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	Studies implemented 2017-2019	Will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
2. <i>Take the initiative to facilitate and catalyse stronger partnerships linking international ARIs in dryland systems research and capacity development with developing country national partners</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u> .	2.a Involve ARI partners in implementing Recommendation 7	Dryland Systems Director	By end of 2016	Yes
		2.b Reach out to and include ARIs in developing DCLAS proposal	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	By end of 2016	Will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
		2.c Collaborate with ARIs to prepare joint proposals to new donors	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016 to 2020	No

¹ The Dryland Systems leadership cannot respond in behalf of the leadership of DCLAS. It can only propose actions to the DCLAS leadership.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
3. <i>Develop a practical, credible and useful theory of change and associated impact pathway for the remaining period of Dryland Systems and more important, for DCLAS</i>	Partially accepted for Dryland Systems as there is too little time to implement it, and resources are too limited.	3.a Will refine impact pathways as part of implementing recommendations 4, 5 and 7	Dryland Systems Global Program	2016	No
	Accepted with reference to DCLAS	3.b Use bottom-up approach to develop DCLAS impact pathway (see response to Recommendation 13)	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016 to 2017	Yes for 2016 to initiate process; further work will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
4. <i>Carry out and publish credible impact assessments, and produce documentation for advocacy</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u>	4.a Identify limited set of promising innovations and implement <i>ex ante</i> impact and cost-benefit evaluations	Dryland Systems Global Program	2016	Yes
		4.b Design DCLAS to facilitate future impact assessments through MEL	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	Will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
		4.c Carry out <i>ex ante</i> assessments of promising innovations	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2017-2022	Yes; needs to be included in proposed DCLAS budget
		4.d Carry out <i>ex post facto</i> assessments of Dryland Systems innovations	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2020-2025	Yes; included in proposed DCLAS budget

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
5. Produce and disseminate a wide range of media that communicate the main findings and state-of-knowledge on dryland systems, the lessons learned, material that can be used for training and capacity development	Accepted in <u>full</u>	5.a Develop and implement a communications work plan linked to implementation of recommendations 4 and 7	Dryland Systems Communication Specialist	2015 to 2016	Yes
		5.b Develop a strong communication program fully integrated with research in DCLAS	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	Will be included in proposed DCLAS budget
6. Promote a strong culture of internal knowledge sharing and communication as integral to the entire research process. A possible specific action to achieve this is to establish a mechanism for sharing draft papers and encouraging informal peer reviews, perhaps through the MEL system	Accepted in <u>full</u> , especially with regard to the design of DCLAS	6.a Implement space online for sharing draft papers (in MEL)	Dryland Systems Research Coordinator	2015 to 2016	No
		6.b Include adequate resources in DCLAS proposal for promoting knowledge sharing tools and underlying culture of sharing	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	Not in short term but resources will be needed as part of DCLAS program
7. To maximize its value, during the final year of	Accepted in <u>full</u>	7.a Allocate as much of Dryland Systems resources	Dryland Systems	2015	Yes, currently proposed resources

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
<i>the Dryland Systems CRP the Program should consolidate its activities and focus most of its resources on producing a body of excellent scientific outputs that define the state of knowledge and provide clear directions for the next phase of research in development on dryland systems. The CRP should draw on outside expertise to complement CGIAR expertise in this endeavour. As part of this effort, the CRP should also undertake a systematic review of literature to make the case for drylands research</i>		as is possible to this work	Director and RMC		are not sufficient
		7.b Create task force of leading scientists from within and outside CRP to plan and lead the work	Dryland Systems Director	2015 to early 2016	Yes, as above
		7.c Prepare peer-reviewed publication making case for dryland systems research	Dryland Systems scientists including partners	2016	Yes, as above
		7.d Synthesize data, organize write-shops, and prepare papers for publication in international journals and possibly co-publish a book on the state of the art of the Dryland System Research with international contributors and ARI involvement	Dryland Systems scientists including partners	2016	Yes, as above
8. Invest in agreeing on a shared understanding of “agricultural systems” that integrates “livelihood systems”, and what is the	Accepted in <u>full</u>	8.a Consult leadership of Humid Tropics and AAS CRPs as well as DCLAS leadership	Dryland Systems Director	2015	No
		8.b If there is agreement, organize joint write-shop to	Directors of participating CRPs	2016	Yes

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
<i>role and value of “systems research”, and invest in training researchers in systems science</i>		prepare a paper articulating shared vision			
9. <i>Strengthen the socio-economic components of systems research with poverty and livelihood assessments, adoption studies, policy and institutional analyses, and in-depth gender and youth studies. This will require recruitment of social and economic science and systems expertise.</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u>	9.a Mobilize existing social science expertise from partners and selected consultants to participate in implementing Recommendation 7	Dryland Systems partners	2016	Yes
		9.b Strengthen social and economic science in DCLAS proposal	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	Will be included in DCLAS proposal
10. <i>Strengthen the accountability of the CRP for the quality of science produce</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u>	10.a Work with other CRP Directors and Consortium Office to find a practical approach	Dryland Systems Director	2015 to 2016	No
		10.b Develop guidelines for attribution of publications to DCLAS	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	No

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
11. <i>The Consortium Office should develop and adopt clearer management guidelines and harmonize templates for planning and reporting to streamline CRP management processes (four specific ideas proposed)</i>	Agree in <u>full</u>	11. Prepare guidelines for <i>mapping projects and budget, harmonize templates (POWB, Annual Reporting), design standardized performance indicators, and review the authority of CRP directors</i>	Consortium Office in consultation with Centres	2016	No

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow up			
		Action to be Taken	Who Responsible for Action ¹	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement recommendation?
<i>12. A holistic integrated systems vision linking socio-economics and agro-ecologies should be the driving force of the DCLAS CRP. This livelihoods perspective should focus on promoting positive systemic change, and have as its central driver finding opportunities for women and youth to thrive along with men by creating multiple livelihood options</i>	Accepted in <u>full</u>	12. Develop a balanced theory of change in DCLAS proposal with stronger focus on livelihoods of women and youth	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2015 to 2016	No; resources for implementation in future will be included in DCLAS budget
<i>13. The design and governance of all the new CRPs should be based on clear demand from developing country clients and partners, and they should play a far stronger role in this process than is currently the case</i>	Agree in <u>full</u>	13.a Follow a more demand-driven approach to designing next phase of CRPs, with national partners playing a strong role	CGIAR – Consortium Office	2015 to 2016	Yes
		13.b Follow a participatory bottom-up approach to designing DCLAS proposal (see response to Recommendation 3)	Proposed to leadership of DCLAS	2016	Yes



RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON
Dryland Systems

The CGIAR Research Program on Dryland Systems aims to improve the lives of 1.6 billion people and mitigate land and resource degradation in 3 billion hectares covering the world's dry areas.

Dryland Systems engages in integrated agricultural systems research to address key socioeconomic and biophysical constraints that affect food security, equitable and sustainable land and natural resource management, and the livelihoods of poor and marginalized dryland communities. The program unifies eight CGIAR Centers and uses unique partnership platforms to bind together scientific research results with the skills and capacities of national agricultural research systems (NARS), advanced research institutes (ARIs), non-governmental and civil society organizations, the private sector, and other actors to test and develop practical innovative solutions for rural dryland communities.

The program is led by the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), a member of the CGIAR Consortium. CGIAR is a global agriculture research partnership for a food secure future.

For more information, please visit

drylandsystems.cgiar.org

Led by:



In partnership with:

