

Evaluation of CGIAR Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE): Management Response

18 April 2016

This Management response referred to here as ‘the WLE Program’ reflects a consolidated perspective of WLE Management (Program Director, Management Team and Operations Unit), WLE Steering Committee Chair, and the Director General and Board Chair of the Lead Center, IWMI.

Introduction

The WLE Program would like to thank the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) and its Evaluation Team for the comprehensive and collaborative manner in which it conducted this independent evaluation. We have found the report supportive and informative, with valuable feedback and recommendations for the program in the development of its full proposal for a second phase. The Report is clear, well written, and overall balanced in its assessment of the program’s progress during its first four years. It covers the breadth of the program and reflects on the various dimensions of performance and results in line with the Terms of Reference and the inception report. We provide below an overall response to the Evaluation Report

Overview

We are very pleased by the Evaluation Team’s overall conclusions that the WLE Program is making good progress, is on track to producing innovative results by the end of 2016, and that it is generating outputs of high standard, some of which are deemed to be of the “highest international standard” (Evaluation Report, p. ix, 79).

The Evaluation Team also concluded that the WLE Program is achieving outcomes at the regional and global levels that contribute effectively to the sustainable management of land, water and ecosystems (p. xi, 54). The WLE Program has, since the outset, had the objective of contributing scientific evidence and solutions for a transition to sustainable intensification of agricultural systems for poverty alleviation and livelihood improvements. This has been a deliberate strategy of contributing both to farming communities and to the development of the CGIAR system at large. The adoption of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Climate Agreement with transition to below 1.5-2C global warming, further strengthen the recommendation by the Evaluation Team that the CGIAR retains a program with WLE’s focus on the interactions between ecosystems and agricultural production (Recommendation 12). This suggests the CGIAR needs further investments in the sustainability and resilience of agricultural development.

We appreciate the Evaluation Team’s acknowledgement of the challenging context within which the program has been implemented while also highlighting the strong operational management of WLE: commending the high caliber of many of the personnel involved in the program Flagships and noting that the regions are managed by staff who are experienced, dedicated and respected in their areas of competence and responsibility (p. ix, 79).

We see these overall statements of support as a strategic opportunity to build on WLE’s unique scope and defining characteristics of multi-disciplinary, multi-scale and multi-sectoral research across water, land and ecosystems. In this light, as WLE finalizes the implementation of phase 1 and prepares for a second phase program, the Evaluation Team has provided a twelve recommendations that will support this transition of which we fully concur with eleven and accept the other one partially.

Our detailed responses to these twelve recommendations and the related follow up actions can be found in the matrix below. However, we would like to highlight here two key points of clarification relate to the WLE budget and WLE's conceptual framework. First, in relation to IWMI's share of the program budget, throughout the Evaluation Report, the allocation of funds to IWMI is represented as 51% of the budget. As pointed out earlier, this figure is not representative of the IWMI research budget and incorporates all program level expenditures. Rather than 51%, IWMI's research budget is represented as 32% of all funding of the program. Footnote 13 (p. 11) of the final report provides this detail, but without this explanation in the main text, readers may misinterpret the budget allocation to IWMI.

Second, while we agree with the Evaluation Team that the Ecosystem Services and Resilience Framework (ESRF) framework can be abstract and has been difficult to fully integrate into the WLE program, the Evaluation Report does not reference cases where the ESRF has been supported, where its use has transformed dialogues with partners, nor where it has contributed to the literature and global initiatives (e.g., IPBES, TEEBAgFood, Capacity building activities with NatCap ecosystem service assessment models, World Bank/GEF Volta Strategic Action Programme). We provide more details on the further development of the ESRF in the matrix below.

Evaluation of CGIAR Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE): Detailed Management Response

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>Recommendation 1. The conceptual underpinning of WLE. WLE should clarify and further develop the conceptual underpinning of the program, including but not limited to the ESRF. The ESRF should be seen as a ‘living’ document to be examined and continuously developed by the program. Specific actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define testable hypotheses for the overall approach and develop a structured program of research and knowledge aggregation activities to examine these hypotheses. • Broaden the scope of the ESRF to include a more complete coverage of institutional, social, economic and livelihoods issues and the analysis of transformative change. 	<p>Accepted. The Ecosystem Services and Resilience framework (ESRF) developed during phase 1 is an important element of WLE’s overall approach, as it provides the basis for a critically important sustainability structure.</p> <p>Our recently submitted phase 2 proposal responds fully to this recommendation. As stated there, we will adapt the ESRF scope, integrating and drawing from elements of other available frameworks, and ensure its relevance to a broader sustainability focus and is flexible enough to</p>	<p>1.1. The WLE phase 2 proposal has articulated a coherent CRP conceptual framework, which will be developed further with key partners as we move toward implementation.</p> <p>1.2. For phase 2, we will adopt a flexible, demand-driven strategy to redefine the ESRF as a sustainability lens to assess proposed agro-ecosystem interventions. It will support the recently adopted SDGs and be tested in collaboration with AFS-CRPs to ensure it will be a practical and comprehensive tool that can be used in multiple contexts. WLE will collaborate very</p>	<p>1.1. WLE phase 2 Core Writing Team.</p> <p>1.2 Leader of ESA Flagship will lead the work on the ESRF framework.</p>	<p>1.1. The phase 2 proposal was submitted in April 2016.</p> <p>1.2. ESRF development will be implemented in 2017-2018.</p>	No.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a closer relationship with the PIM CRP which has the mandate and expertise to address a number of the concerns over the scope and focus of the WLE approach, including in relation to institutional and policy analysis. Recognize and integrate a wide range of research traditions and methods and avoid prescriptive use of the ESRF in all activities and at all institutional levels. Develop the framework as a flexible set of concepts and principles that can be adapted to the specific context and key issues of different focal regions and flagships/clusters. 	adapt to multiple contexts.	<p>closely with PIM in this work, as is stated in the phase 2 proposal.</p> <p>1.3. Further refinement of the overall CRP conceptual framework will be done as part of detailed work plans for 2017 and beyond.</p>	1.3. The new Director of WLE, who will mobilize in the 3 rd quarter of 2016, will lead the refinement of WLE's broad conceptual foundation.	1.3. Further clarification of WLE conceptual underpinning late 2016 to mid-2017.	
Recommendation 2. WLE's Theory of Change. WLE's theory of change needs to be strengthened. It should relate directly to the analysis of change and clearly set out a usable and adaptable approach to examine change processes at all levels. This should be done in	Accepted. Articulating a credible TOC for the NRM focused CRPs is a complex challenge Unlike the case for commodity research, there is no clear, single pathway for NRM and	2.1. The TOC was thoroughly revised in the WLE phase 2 pre-proposal resubmission to consider the wider social and institutional aspects of the specific changes processes the program aims to	2.1. WLE Phase 2 Core Writing Team.	2.1. Completed on 2 April 2016; any further work needed will be done later in 2016.	Funds will be sought to support the decision analysis work on WLE impact pathways; and for additional analysis on barriers and drivers of change in agricultural systems.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>parallel with the actions described in Recommendation 1, reflecting the close association between the program’s conceptual approach and the theory of change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake an analysis of what the program is seeking to change • Undertake an analysis of the drivers of and barriers to change in agricultural systems at all scales and institutional levels • Develop a structured approach to the analysis of social and institutional aspects of the change processes. This should build on and expand the work on behavioral economics currently found in the DAI core theme. • Give explicit consideration to potential externalities at all spatial and temporal scales and along relevant value chains. 	<p>policy-oriented research for development to lead directly to measurable outcomes and impacts and the numbers of actors involved in the process is considerable. The ISPC has acknowledged this in numerous SPIA-commissioned studies.¹</p> <p>Nevertheless, in relation to these and other comments, WLE has completely revised its TOC and impact pathways for phase 2, and the ISPC appreciated the progress made in its comments on our revised pre-proposal.</p> <p>The program does not currently have the</p>	<p>achieve. The revised TOC was positively received by the ISPC, and has been further expanded upon in the full proposal. If necessary, we will refine it further in response to the ISPC feedback.</p> <p>2.2 During the implementation of phase 2, we will continuously assess and refine the TOC and impact pathways as necessary. It will be a management tool, and a source of learning how to be more effective in achieving outcomes and impacts.</p> <p>2.3 A specific initiative to apply the DAI decision analysis work</p>	<p>2.2. WLE Phase 2 Flagship Leaders supported by the manager, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL).</p> <p>2.3 DAI Flagship Team with Flagship Leaders</p>	<p>2.2. Continuously during phase 2 implementation.</p> <p>2.3 By 2019, contingent on funding.</p>	

¹ Merrey (2015) provides a summary of many of these studies. Full citation: Merrey, D.J. 2015. An Evaluation of CGIAR Centers’ Impact Assessment Work on Irrigation and Water Management Research. Rome, Italy, Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (SPIA), CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC). 83 pp.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
	resources to adopt all the details of this recommendation but we will treat our TOC as a hypothesis to be tested and refined or revised periodically based on lessons learned.	approach to the impact pathways within WLE has been outlined in the phase 2 proposal as part of the RBM strategy.	supported by MEL Manager.		
Recommendation 3. Nurturing young scientists. WLE should assign sufficient resources to maintain the positive feature of having a significant number of junior scientists as project leaders. Specific actions should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage collaboration between young and senior scientists • Encourage mentoring of young by senior scientists to generate good publications and visibility. 	Accepted. The Evaluation Team has highlighted the positive experience of WLE in using promising junior scientists as project leaders, while senior scientists provide strong mentoring and intellectual support. We plan to continue this practice and our senior scientists will continue to mentor younger scientists, both within the CGIAR center partners and our national partners. Our university partners also	As noted by the evaluation team, WLE already has a good mix of senior and junior scientists, and we were commended for how we mentor and encourage junior scientists. Greater attention will be given in Phase 2 to facilitate collaboration and mentoring.	WLE Director assisted by senior scientists.	Continuous throughout the program.	No. However, additional funding would enable WLE to expand its support for post-graduate and post-doctoral scientists and facilitate more formalized mentoring.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
	play a critical role in this regard.				
<p>Recommendation 4. WLE publication policy. WLE participating Centers should commit to fully following WLE publication policy. Specific actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All publications should be internally peer-reviewed • No WLE publications should appear in predatory journals. 	<p>Accepted in principle. All scientific reports are already peer reviewed internally. WLE participating Centers commit to following WLE publication policy as part of their contractual agreements (PPAs). This policy is in line with CGIAR policy. WLE will continue to promote its publication policy and provide opportunities for researchers to better understand it. In regards to predatory journals, WLE received a very high rating in the Elsevier analysis and the occurrence of articles in predatory journals was very rare. Measures will be taken to ensure they are completely excluded.</p>	<p>4.1 Promote the publication policy amongst WLE participating Centers.</p> <p>4.2 Carry out an audit of predatory publications for publications in 2015 to clarify how many, if any, there are, and take action to stop this practice if it exists.</p> <p>4.3 Review and update publication policy as necessary.</p>	<p>4.1. WLE Knowledge Management & Communications (KMC) .</p> <p>4.2. WLE KMC and partner KMC.</p> <p>4.3. WLE KMC and partner KMC.</p>	<p>4.1. August 2016.</p> <p>4.2. By September 2016.</p> <p>4.3. October – December 2016.</p>	No.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>Recommendation 5. Dedicated research facilities. There is need, opportunity and capability for long-term research at dedicated field facilities strategically located in developing countries. WLE should play a role in maintaining and establishing such long-term research facilities because well-managed and well-instrumented field and catchment scale laboratories are needed to underpin the research of WLE and other CRPs. Such studies are also essential to provide much needed empirical data for calibrating and validating the extensive WLE's modelling efforts. Specific actions that are needed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop strategic collaboration with institutes that have field and catchment scale laboratories or are willing to invest in them. • Undertake multi-scalar research at spatial scales that 	<p>Accepted in part. We agree that having long-term dedicated strategically located field sites that are well-managed and fully-instrumented can be very useful for some types of biophysical research interventions or impact assessments. They may not be appropriate, though, for fully capturing the cycle of R4D research where the program moves on from discovery to implementation and onward to new areas of research and challenges. Moreover, establishing and maintaining such sites also requires committed funding over a long time period. In the current financial context, this is</p>	<p>5.1. Where appropriate, explore with Center partners, AFS CRPs, and NARS with which we are partnering to identify potential field sites where a WLE co-investment would be cost-effective and provide a higher return on research investment than alternative approaches.</p> <p>5.2. Assess the potential for additional W3 or bilateral funding for participating in existing field laboratories.</p> <p>5.3. Where practical, include in phase 2 POWBs investments in such field sites.</p>	<p>Flagship Leaders and WLE Director.</p>	<p>By December 2016.</p>	<p>Not initially. Additional funding may be required for instrumentation and management of field sites over the longer term.</p>

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
range from the field to the river basin	<p>extremely unlikely and could compromise higher value interventions in other areas.</p> <p>However, WLE recognizes that some long-established Centers have such sites, as do some of our national partners. In addition, AFS CRPs may be supporting such field laboratories; during phase 2 WLE will be collaborating closely with several of these CRPs.</p> <p>WLE will explore with these partners whether a WLE co-investment would generate useful empirical data and added value. In addition, WLE will seek to continue its collaboration with</p>				

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
	watershed and river basin programs such as the Tana Water Fund in Kenya in order to collect long-term data on impacts of interventions and other basin organizations which routinely maintain such data sets.				
Recommendation 6. Learning, knowledge synthesis and aggregation. WLE should make a focused effort to learn from its experience in different types of projects and within and across focal regions. Specific actions should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a strategy for knowledge synthesis and aggregation across the program. • Allocate sufficient resources, and leadership from among the strongest researchers in WLE. To facilitate this process, WLE should establish a strategic 	Accepted. Although WLE is still at a relatively early stage given the long-term nature of its work, the Steering Committee had requested something along these lines in March 2015. WLE management developed a proposal for a “ WLE Solutions Platform ”. That concept is broader than what the evaluation team recommends but includes as a major element, synthesis of	6.1 WLE has already begun this process as noted. For background, the synthesis document is available here . However, resource constraints mean we cannot implement this as quickly as we would like. 6.2. Initiate knowledge synthesis work around a small set of cross-cutting themes during 2016.	WLE’s new Director, supported by the Flagship Leaders and making use of postgraduate students.	2016-2017	Yes.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>group working directly under the Program Director to be responsible both for the development of the overall program strategy and the identification and management of key syntheses products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide resources to flagship leaders to instigate and facilitate discussions on key themes in project clusters, with support from lead researchers in the field (both inside and outside WLE), to identify generic conclusions and areas where results are specific to the context of individual projects. • Where this has not happened, undertake global reviews of the 'state of the art' for the key themes. 	<p>knowledge organized around a set of key WLE research questions.</p> <p>Budget constraints during 2015-2016 have prevented us from making much progress on this to date; and we do not have sufficient resources to establish the proposed "strategic working group." Nevertheless, we do propose to make progress on developing credible, systematic syntheses of knowledge during the next phase.</p>	<p>6.3. Include knowledge synthesis in the work plan for year one (2017) in WLE phase 2.</p> <p>6.4. Seek additional funding to ensure the scientific quality of the synthesis products.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 7. Impact Assessment. The Evaluation Team recommends that WLE should make strategic investment in impact assessment taking into account available resources. Specific</p>	<p>Accepted. The proposal to make strategic investments in impact assessment is agreed, based on a plan that reflects strategic importance, scale of</p>	<p>7.1 The WLE phase 2 proposal includes a specific evaluation and impact assessment strategy and plan, including a range of assessments highlighted</p>	<p>Manager, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, supported by the Program Management</p>	<p>The plan is included in the proposal for phase 2. If fully funded, impact assessments will begin in 2017.</p>	<p>Yes. Bilateral funds have already been sought; additional funds will be needed to fully implement this recommendation.</p>

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake new impact assessment studies, as previously recommended by Merrey (2015), • Define a plan of impact assessments • Include meta-syntheses that assess outcomes across projects to provide an understanding of the effectiveness (or otherwise) of different approaches to addressing key development themes within the program [points summarized] 	<p>innovation, resource investment and capacity of researchers and partners. Specific proposals for impact assessments are included in the WLE proposal for phase 2.</p>	<p>by Merrey (2015). Some are proposed to be funded using W1/2 funds; for others we are seeking funding from bilateral sources, e.g. through 3IE and other impact assessment funding bodies.</p>	<p>Unit and Flagship Leaders.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 8. Partnerships WLE management should do a comprehensive stocktaking of existing partnerships across the program. Specific actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify where the best potential exists for consolidating partnerships at cluster and regional levels. • Initiate a dialogue with partners on actions to ensure 	<p>Accepted. This activity was planned for the 2nd half of 2016. However, because of the uncertainty of phase 2 and funding concerns, it is difficult to make any firm commitments as yet. However, we plan to update the Phase 2 partnership strategy based on feedback</p>	<p>8.1. Update phase 2 partnership strategy based on the IEA review recommendations and ISPC feedback on the phase 2 proposal.</p> <p>8.2. Once the future is clearer, develop clear messages for current partners in phase 1 projects (particularly in</p>	<p>8.1. Program Management Unit</p> <p>8.2. Program Management Unit, including Flagship and Project Leaders.</p>	<p>8.1. July – September 2016</p> <p>8.2. October – December 2016</p>	<p>No</p>

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>continuity in partnerships to mitigate the impact of existing funding uncertainties over the future of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize that different partnerships may be needed for different ToC steps or pathways (e.g. for moving from research outputs to development outcomes). 	<p>from ISPC and this IEA review. That strategy already fully reflects a recognition that different partnerships are needed at different stages along the impact pathways.</p>	<p>focal regions) and discuss potential options for continuing in phase 2.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 9 Gender. WLE should employ a dual strategy in its gender work. Specific actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine how gender integrates into WLE’s technical priorities (as is being done) but also identify a few separate gender priorities and develop research questions around them. Provide GPI with research resources to support some cutting edge transformative work specifically on gender, aimed at understanding how gender disparities and gender relations effect agricultural 	<p>Accepted. This recommendation is fully reflected in the WLE phase 2 proposal. We have integrated gender issues into specific Flagship Clusters of Activities in a very substantial manner. The Gender in Development core theme will develop a comprehensive framework to ensure the full integration of gender into Flagship research in a way that leads to cutting edge results. We have also</p>	<p>9.1. Inclusion of the dual strategy in the WLE phase 2 proposal, though given limited resources, we emphasize integration of gender into Flagship research.</p> <p>9.2 Seek additional funding from W3 and bilateral sources to include additional partners with strengths in gender-NRM research and development.</p>	<p>9.1 WLE Gender Specialist.</p> <p>9.2 WLE Gender Specialist.</p>	<p>9.1. WLE phase 2 proposal completed and submitted in April 2016.</p> <p>9.2. Preparation of proposals for additional funding in latter half of 2016 and in 2017.</p>	<p>Yes. WLE has allocated over 10% of its anticipated W1/2 funding to gender, but this is inadequate to fully implement this recommendation. Therefore, additional funds will be sought.</p>

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
innovation, productivity and sustainability. • Identify a few partners that have expertise in working with women and technology at the grassroots level.	reached out to new partners to further strengthen our gender work.				
Recommendation 10. Composition and role of the WLE Steering Committee. The Steering Committee should reassess its composition. Specific actions should include the following: • Include one or more members with training in social sciences research. • Undertake a rigorous and holistic debate on the role of ESR in the sustainable intensification of production by closely engaging researchers from various disciplines, including scientists who can bring agriculturalists' perspectives.	Accepted. Section 7.5 (page 77) of the IEA evaluation states that "WLE has a balanced and independent governance body, that brings together appropriate expertise, includes a majority of independent expert members, and accommodates lead center and partner representation." We greatly appreciate this conclusion of the IEA team. The importance of the social and agricultural sciences within the Steering Committee is also recognized; we note	10.1. As stated in WLE's phase 2 proposal, as current members of the SC complete their terms, we will identify replacements that maintain a good distribution of skills (including social and agricultural sciences) while ensuring regional and gender balances. The SC will continue to engage with the program scientists on adapting and broadening the ESR framework, the Solutions Platform, and other critically important strategic issues.	The WLE Steering Committee and Lead Center Board	2017-2022.	No.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
	<p>there is already considerable practical experience in these areas amongst its members. The Phase 2 proposal includes provision for reviewing the composition and skills mix of the Steering Committee and this is on the agenda for the next meeting in June 2016.</p> <p>As noted in our response to Recommendation 6, the SC is already fully engaged in dialogue with WLE scientists on the ESR framework and has supported the emphasis in phase 2 towards a broader sustainability focus.</p>				
Recommendation 11. Strategic management and Program Planning and Integration.	Accepted. During Phase 1, it was not possible to deviate from the proportional	11.1 WLE is moving towards enhanced results based management in Phase 2,	Program Management Unit	2017-22.	No.

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
<p>Specific actions should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a prioritization mechanism to deal with budget cuts, focused on WLE’s own primary objectives as a CRP. This is preferable to using a proportional formula to allocate budget cuts across flagships. • Ensure the new system is transparent and agreed upon by main players. The criteria for mapping bilateral projects into WLE should be documented and the responsibility for reviewing and approving of this mapping should be assigned to flagship leaders with the WLE director providing final approval. 	<p>formula to allocate budget cuts (or increases) due to the original “commitments” by Centers to each CRP, together with a lack of a firm Results based management (RMB) mechanism.</p> <p>WLE is committed to moving towards RBM in Phase 2, however the current proposal guidance requires CRPs in the short term to specify at this early stage how funds will be allocated to CG partners within each flagship, and it will only be possible to see the full results of an RBM approach in years 2-3 when the evaluation of initial activities has been undertaken against pre-established performance criteria.</p>	<p>with a clear strategy in the proposal around performance based resource (re)allocation in years 3 and 5 (based on aggregate performance in the preceding period). However, the requirement in the phase 2 full proposal guidance for CRPs to specify ex-ante how funds will be allocated to CG partners within each flagship, again places the onus on the partner, rather than the content.</p> <p>In collaboration with WLE’s partners, efforts will be made to adopt the RBM approach outlined to ensure that within these strictures, allocative decisions are still made around</p>			

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
		<p>performance and potential results.</p> <p>In the future, Flagship Leaders will review and approve bilateral projects, with the Program Director providing only final approval. This needs to be considered within the CGIAR context however, balancing WLE priorities, Center stability, and capacity to support Center partners in leveraging bilateral funds.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 12. The Continuing Imperative of WLE. The Evaluation Team strongly recommends that the CGIAR retains a program with WLE's focus on the interactions between ecosystems and agricultural production. It should serve as an integrative CRP at levels of organization beyond the plot or field which</p>	<p>Accepted. WLE entirely agrees and appreciates this endorsement by the Evaluation Team. We believe that this recognition of the value of an integrative CRP focused on agriculture within an ecosystems and NRM perspective,</p>	<p>12.1. This recommendation is aimed at the CGIAR itself. WLE will make every effort to work closely with other integrative CRPs and with the AFS CRPs to add value to the entire CGIAR Research Portfolio.</p>	<p>WLE's Steering Committee and Management Committee, with the support of the CGIAR community.</p>	<p>Continuous.</p>	<p>No.</p>

Evaluation Recommendation (numbered with summarized supporting statements)	Management Response to the Recommendation	Management Follow-up			
		Action to be taken (each action has a reference number)	Who Responsible for Action (keyed to actions)	Timeframe	Is additional funding required to implement Recommendation?
are the targets of many other CRPs (e.g. at the catchment, basin and regional scales) and it should take explicit account of externalities and trade-offs that can become apparent at these scales. The specific form of such a program and its relationship to other CRPs needs to be established but to not have such a program, whatever the details of its form and institutional focus, would risk the momentum that has been established by WLE in the CGIAR's long-term efforts and programs on natural resources management.	and targeting levels above farms and fields, is now well-established in the SRF, within the new CRP portfolio and within the ISPC.				