

ISPC Commentary on the Forests, Trees and Agroforestry Phase-II – Pre-proposal (2017-2022)

Summary

CRP Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry (FTA) aims to advance knowledge on improving production systems, enhancing livelihoods, and promoting equitable distribution of benefits, all while protecting and enhancing the resource base *through a better understanding of the interactions between productivity and ecosystem services in tree-based systems* (emphasis added). FTA Phase II aims to address multiple grand challenges of poverty, food security and nutrition, and sustainable resource management, and continues to be strategically relevant. The pre-proposal is well written, compelling and shows clear evidence of improvement on Phase I based on lessons learned, IEA evaluation, and ISPC extension phase commentary. The research program appears a more coherent whole. FTA Phase-II proposes seven Flagships, including two new Flagships on delivering inclusion and scaling impact (Supporting Platform 1) and tree genetic resources (Flagship 4), and has expanded research on production aspects of FT&A resources and repositioned its tenure and land rights work – these changes appear appropriate and credible. Governance function has been strengthened by the reconstitution of the Independent Steering Committee (ISC) in 2015 and its expanded mandate, including decision-making power on the inclusion of bilateral projects. FTA has also increased the depth and breadth of its collaborations with other CRPs, namely A4NH, CCAFS, DCLAS, Maize, PIM, RTB, Wheat, and WLE.

Recommendation: The ISPC considers this pre-proposal **Satisfactory with adjustment**, and recommends inviting the proponents to submit a full proposal, taking into account the ISPC's comments below or providing justification for the lack of change:

- FTA should continue to consider and explicitly state its comparative and collaborative advantage in establishing and deepening strategic partnerships.
- The full proposal should specify assumptions (based on credible science) underlying the CRP-level ToC and FP-level hypotheses, including consideration of the trade-offs.
- The pre-proposal's consideration of enabling environment is at a fairly high level, and the full proposal should clearly spell out how this has (and will) influenced framing of research questions and strategies at all levels.
- While FTA Phase II has a clearer rationale on sentinel sites, now nested within four ecological observatory landscapes, the linkage and integration of activities in these sites (Flagship 6) with other Flagships needs to be clearly articulated. Similarly, site integration plans with other CRPs need better rationale and justification.
- FP4 (management and restoration of trees) requires reconsideration, and three Flagships (FP1, FP5, FP7) need reformulation or reconceptualization as per the commentaries below for specific Flagships (Section 6).

Overall score: B

1. Overall analysis as an integral part of the CRP portfolio [Rating: A]

The case for FTA's strategic relevance is clearly established in the first few paragraphs of the pre-proposal: that forests, trees, and agro-forestry (FT&A) systems are fundamental to sustaining food systems, ecosystem services, and mitigation or adaptation to climate change, and that FT&A resources have been degraded by suboptimal management. FTA Phase II aims to contribute to addressing the multiple grand challenges of poverty, food security and nutrition¹, climate change, and sustainable resource (water, land, forests, biodiversity) management and conservation, as is evident in the seven SDGs that it aligns with. These grand challenges are also reflected in the design of six Flagships (numbered 2-7, with a Supporting Platform Flagship 1). The range and depth of FTA's authentic and functional partnerships within the CGIAR are also a testament to its strategic centrality and relevance.

FTA, in many senses, appears to be a hybrid of the old "systems" CRPs with integrative and AFS-CRPs. This approach, integrative in nature, is evident in the research questions which Flagships (hereafter FPs) address. A key ISPC recommendation (extension phase) was based on the concern that FTA appeared to be a framework that contained compelling but independent projects. In this pre-proposal, ISPC notes significant improvement in program coherence, even as it recognizes that specific FPs or activities within FPs would benefit from a degree of reformulation. It is now easier to see the potential for FTA to be greater than the sum of Flagships and research activities within.

There is also good evidence that Phase I experience has informed the design of FTA Phase II. For instance, some research activities have been scaled down and others scaled up: FTA has created a new cross-cutting platform on prioritization, impact at scale, and social inclusion (SP1) as well as increased the emphasis on the production side of FT&A. Similarly, there is evidence that recommendations from the IEA evaluation and ISPC extension phase commentary have been acted upon. With respect to the ISPC's commentary, three of six key *must-haves* have been addressed in their entirety: that is, there is (1) more coherence in the portfolio; (2) clarity on sentinel sites (now under 'observatory landscapes'), even if this can be further elaborated and improved; and, (3) evidence of better linkages with other CRPs. Additionally, FTA has put in place mechanisms to address the three other *must-haves*: (1) through the ISC, it intends to evaluate its partnership strategy; (2) the ISC review of partnership strategy seems to hold the potential to address questions on comparative and collaborative advantage; and, (3) there is greater attention to political economy of the policy processes via proposed activities in the Supporting Platform.

FTA equates site integration with country collaboration, and while this appears reasonable in the light of CGIAR nomenclature and practice, this could use elaboration in the full proposal. There are broader residual issues regarding what were described as "sentinel landscapes" in Phase I, but are now referred to as "observatory landscapes". The rationale, framing, and commitment to these "observatory landscapes" seems clearer in this pre-proposal than in Phase I. Of the five potential ecological zones, the pre-proposal uses clear, sound principles to prioritize four (p. 112). However, activities related to observatory landscapes are nested within FP6 (landscape dynamics), and linkage/integration with other FPs is not evident.

Overall, the FTA pre-proposal makes credible scientific arguments at the CRP level, and makes a clear distinction between holistic and reductionist research, which is very welcome. Explicit

¹ Note that the full proposal does need to justify better the inclusion of nutrition indicators and targets.

statement of testable research hypotheses (some FP-level hypotheses may require reformulation) and underlying assumptions on a credible science based case would strengthen the full proposal².

2. Theory of Change and Impact Pathway [Rating: B]

The concept of research in development (RiD) proposed by FTA is promising both as a means to actively test hypotheses and challenge assumptions in the ToC, and as a way to improve effectiveness of activities in their impact pathways. However, even as there might be an implicit ToC in the narrative, the ToC diagram is not sufficient: critical assumptions and information on trade-offs are missing (ISPC 2012), even as three CRP-level hypotheses are stated. While the initial discussion of impact pathways is sufficient – three interconnected uptake and adoption pathways are identified, the clarity of description and strength of the case for feasibility of ToC and impact pathways for individual FPs varies substantially. Overall, FTA can plausibly contribute to all three SLOs, and has attempted to strongly align itself with selected sub-IDOs and IDOs in the SRF.

3. Cross-cutting themes

‘Gender’ is covered in some detail in the pre-proposal, and the evolutionary nature of this component in the CGIAR is recognized. The gender section covers gender analyses in FTA; operationalising gender in FTA Phase II; a renewed focus on transformative gender research; and, monitoring progress and measuring results. ISPC’s portfolio commentary (extension phase) raised a key question on how consideration of gender had affected framing of research questions and strategies within CRPs. It is encouraging to see that FTA has responded to this. For instance, FP2 (tree genetic resources) cluster of activities (hereafter CoA) 2.2 will engage women as well as youth and older groups in setting values, species priorities, and traits for selection; and, FP3 hypothesizes that NRM management that is more inclusive of women will be more effective. There is a section on gender and youth in the descriptions of six of the seven Flagships, but gender has more emphasis than youth (indicative of the fact that issues that specifically affect youth are yet to be defined). Capacity development is addressed at Flagship level in FP2 to FP7, is an activity in SP1 (delivering impact and inclusion), and appears adequately addressed. The range of capacity development related activities include the development of training materials; training of researchers through fellowships and collaborative research; and, planned research with private organizations and public agencies. The pre-proposal also states that data and methods will be shared through open access platforms.

The consideration of the enabling environment, however integrated in the pre-proposal, is at a high level. The enabling environment receives attention, to an extent, in the framing of individual FP research questions³. More importantly, there are a number of activities in SP1 i.e., CoAs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5 on foresight, capacity development, and knowledge management, communication and outreach for impact that could contribute to addressing the enabling environment. Since a significant component of FTA research has implications for FT&A resources related policymaking, it could do well to explain if and how relevance and appropriateness of research activities to policymakers and practitioners is assessed *ex-ante*: it is not sufficient to understand policy processes and drivers.

² As an example of this, FTA II hypothesis “(iii) diversity at all scales increases resilience against global change via provision of ecosystem system, and this benefits populations from the local to the global level” needs justification vis-à-vis evidence-based assumptions.

³ For instance, CoA 3.3 will examine what is required in terms of an enabling environment to switch from unsustainable monocultures to more diverse and resilient production practices.

Besides a reference to ‘co-production of science’ (FP7, forests and climate change), information on this aspect is sparse.

4. Budget

FTA Phase II 2017-2022 budget is based on an estimate of the Full-time Equivalents (FTE) for senior scientists and above, and this appears to be a credible and useful approach. Based on existing financial data and Phase I implementation, FTA estimates that 1 FTE is about USD 900,000 a year, and 124 FTEs are needed for Phase II (2017-2022): a total budget of approximately USD 750 million (40% Windows 1/2, 60% Window 3/bilateral). Details on how USD 0.9 million a year per FTE was arrived at, and year-on-year split in W1&2 and W3/bilateral funding (at the FP-level, even if based on expected fund flows) is required to better assess appropriateness at full proposal stage.

At the Flagship level, FP3 and FP7 receive the highest share of budget: 23% each over 2017-2022. The proportions received by other FPs are as follows: FP2 and FP6 – 15%; FP5 – 10%; FP4 and Supporting Platform 1 – 8% and 7% respectively. It is encouraging that considerable resource (USD 6-8 mn a year) has been set aside for SP1 that includes trend analysis; outcome and impact assessments; and collation, integration, and publishing of large datasets.

5. Governance and management [Rating: B]

IEA evaluation recommended a recasting of the Independent Steering Committee (ISC) to expand its mandate and strengthen its role, and FTA has acted on the recommendation. The draft Terms of Reference (hereafter ToR) for the new ISC (already operational) are compelling, and the ISC will play a major role in a wide range of programmatic management decisions⁴ as well as inform scientific issues. In broader terms though, the discussion of governance in this pre-proposal is (understandably) sketchy. Greater elaboration of key governance and accountability functions is necessary in the full proposal. For instance, governance arrangements are proposed to be foundation of mechanisms for articulation and collaboration across the CRP. As an important development, this deserves more discussion in the full proposal.

Currently, the DDG-Research of CIFOR (the lead Center) is acting as the FTA Director, and CIFOR intends to appoint a new FTA Director in the last quarter of 2015 in close collaboration with the ISC. As the new Director is not yet in place and only some of the FP/CoA leaders have been chosen, it is perhaps premature to comment on their track record. With this caveat, those core FP personnel whose CVs have been included appear to have the right skills and experience. In the case of Supporting Platform 1, the range of disciplines and experience of core team members (economics, sociology, development studies, impact assessment, agroecology) is impressive, and highly appropriate to the objectives of the platform. The ToR that has been developed for the Management Team, and the job description for the FP leaders seem appropriate, even if not detailed.

FTA continues to classify its partners as *research* (now sub-categorized into Tier-1 and Tier-2); *knowledge-sharing*; and *policy and practitioner* (global agribusiness, financial institutions, and business platforms) partners. It is building strong linkages with anticipated AFS-CRPs (Wheat, Livestock, Maize, RTB, and DCLAS), and continues to have strong partnerships with the integrative CRPs (CCAFS, WLE, PIM, and A4NH). While synergies with most integrative and some AFS-CRPs are well-described and comprehensive, others need more detail.

⁴ This includes strategic planning, oversight and monitoring of FTA portfolio; performance review using information from annual reports and other reviews to make recommendations; and, resource allocation.

In its extension phase commentary, ISPC recommended greater attention to precise functions and value-add of specific partnerships. It is encouraging to see differentiation between Tier-1 and Tier-2 (presumably) research partners in the pre-proposal, and some reference to the expertise they bring, e.g. cutting-edge modelling capacities and complementary science expertise such as genetic analysis capacities. However, an overarching partnership strategy is not supplied in the main part of the pre-proposal. It is noted that individual FPs do have a clear description of the role and/or comparative advantage of the breadth of partners that they engage with, particularly in FPs 2, 5 and 7. While such descriptions are welcome, a partnership strategy should be made more evident – detailing rationale, the categories of partners, their collaborative/comparative advantage etc. – because questions do arise. For instance, are there gaps where new private sector partners (other than Mars Inc. and Unilever) might play a role? What role would IFAD or WWD play in delivery at scale? How are such partnership needs assessed?

6. Flagships

Flagship 1: Supporting Platform 1 on delivering impact and inclusion [Rating: B]

The research and supporting function this FP provides is extremely relevant to FTA, and may well become critical to its success. While the CoAs point to an underlying ToC and planned activities are specified, the presentation could be improved significantly if assumptions underlying hypotheses and scientific approach were stated clearly. How does FTA intend to identify priority areas for *ex-post* impact assessments or foresight analysis, in the context of resource constraints? This FP is budgeted at just a little over 7% of FTA funds. The opportunities to leverage additional funds may be limited for this key component program, and in those respects, the budget for this FP may be too small and it also probably merits priority for W1/2 funds going to FTA.

Flagship 2: Tree genetic resources to bridge production gaps and promote resilience [Rating: A]

This FP brings together research on safeguarding genetic diversity, tree domestication, and tree-planting material delivery. It is highly relevant and compelling: the ToC is the clearest among all the FTA FPs, connecting research activities with key outcomes and potential impacts. But, there is no accompanying impact pathway diagram for the FP or CoAs, and some of the impact claims are debatable – hence, elaboration would strengthen the FP narrative. While the CoA key questions suggest underlying hypotheses, in the full proposal explicit statements of the hypotheses and assumptions are needed. Having said that, there is visible sign of progress in this FP, and clear evidence of having learnt from experience. Key research questions are exemplary in their ‘researchability’ and practical implications, combining both a sense of the strategic knowledge required for IPG delivery and how that knowledge will directly contribute to development outcomes. Also notable is the spatial integration across CoAs, and the explicit theory of place. The comparative advantage is strong – in many senses, this is the AFS-CRP portion of FTA, and this work appears to be critical to other FTA FPs (3-7). However, beyond statements on how FTA will learn about innovative approaches for genetic improvement and AFS-CRPs benefitting from FTA knowledge on environment-genetic approaches for marker-assisted selection, clarity is needed on how the outputs and outcomes will achieve synergy or be integrated with other AFS-CRPs.

There is a good and relevant discussion on gender (i.e., consideration of how gender *informs* research), and the role of youth and elderly. Capacity development is better discussed than in other FPs: of note, a fellowship program for African breeders. While there is recognition of ‘enabling environment’, this could be strengthened: for instance, documenting what is known about failures in markets and policies (which could be an IPG relevant to other seed systems). Given the emphasis

on genetic material, there is a surprising lack of discussion on IP and open access / data sharing policy. FP2 has one of the second highest proportions of budgetary allocations (15%), but may also have strong prospects for bilateral funding (which is appropriate and desirable).

Flagship 3: Enhancing how trees and forests contribute to smallholder livelihoods [Rating: A]

The strategic relevance to the CRP and CGIAR in addressing the farm-forest interface, through research on forest-based and high-value tree crop production systems to improve smallholder economic outcomes, is clear. But, the connections between FP2 and FP3 should be made stronger. For example, how does FP3 research shape FP2 priorities? The “Research in Development” (RiD) concept presented here (in general terms) is clear conceptually, but the statement does not, by itself, constitute a ToC. To the contrary, important RiD opportunities could be missed by the lack of elaboration of a specific ToC for FP3; for the full proposal, it seems appropriate to expect well-developed, clear, compelling RiD hypotheses and assumptions in a coherent and credible ToC for this FP and its CoAs; those hypotheses and assumptions then become the focus and benchmark for learning in the RiD activities. In some senses, measures that are favourable to smallholders in the production of major commodity crops is an under-invested area, and this work could be scaled in FP3.

While less effective than FP2 in conveying lessons learned and how these have shaped plans for Phase II, evidence of greater focus is clear. Enabling environment is considered in CoAs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 but could be stated in detail, and discussion of gender and capacity development could be made less generic. Upstream partnerships appear strategically chosen as are local partners, and strong private sector partnerships continue. However, given the ambitious targets (100 million smallholders) and reliance on development partners, FTA should give considerable thought to how it will handle partners failing to engage or deliver.

CGIAR does have a comparative advantage in this area, and established partnerships with other CRPs (WLE, DCLAS, CCAFS, RTB etc.) is an indicator of the relevance. But, at least for CoAs 3.2 and 3.3, many of the key questions have been pursued for some time. While these questions have practical significance, FTA could better clarify the IPGs that will be produced by replicating these studies beyond what past studies (over the decades) have already learned. For instance, it is recognized that imperfect market access is ubiquitous and that there are many complex contextual issues at play, but what strategic issues will these studies shed light on? Another weakness is in portrayal of sites as lists with neither rationale for specific site selection nor rationale for why these sites were selected rather than others (unlike FP2 where activities are purposefully co-located). Prospects for bilateral funding seem promising in FP3 as well. All 5 outcomes associated with this FP receive an equal amount of funding, and since they are at varying levels (e.g. closing yield gaps through improved pasture management and husbandry; increased food and nutrition security through closing yield gaps), FTA could do well to justify these allocations.

Flagship 4: Management and restoration of forests [Rating: C]

This Flagship aims to research options for meeting the demand for forest resources by increasing their productivity through better management of natural or planted forests, and restoration of degraded forests. It has developed partly in response to recommendations in the FTA evaluation. This is one of the weakest FPs of FTA: while the issues identified matter, in fact significantly for a number of poor people, there is not a compelling broader strategic case for IPG-relevant research or a stand alone FP. For example why is forest genetics work separate from tree genetics work in FP2? The ISPC has a number of concerns about the two CoAs and the case for the 2 clusters of

activity being in the same Flagship has not been made in the pre-proposal. For CoA 4.1, it is hard to reconcile the focus on forests managed by communities with some of the suggested research questions e.g. demand for timber at national level in priority countries. Questions 1 and 4 seem to focus on the multiple use aspect of forests which the Cluster title leads one to expect as the focus, but Questions 2, 3 and 5, while worthy of themselves don't seem to fit? The link with nutrition seems to focus on bushmeat, which is undoubtedly important in some countries but a more holistic consideration of how forest communities use the forest for their diet is an alternative option. CoA 4.2 rightly raises the risks of restoration in the introductory text, but those risks don't appear so clearly in the proposed research questions. Many of the key research questions posed are ones that have been examined before and ISPC would have expected to see examples of lessons learned, in particular in relation to how these lines of research can be used to produce IPGs? While FP scientists and partners do have much of the necessary expertise, a better case on comparative and collaborative advantage of FTA (and CGIAR) to engage in this space has to be made in the full proposal. For example, more details on the property rights and local institutions issues that create enabling conditions for restoration and a clearer case for the comparative advantage of the CGIAR in restoration. The geography of site selection seems more driven by a traditional forestry research agenda than by considerations of scope for impact on CGIAR IDOs and SLOs, and deserves reassessment. The budget for this FP4 equals that of FP1, and 50% of budget is bilateral.

Recommendations:

- The coherence of this FP based on the 2 clusters identified should be reassessed and consideration given to merging the clusters into other FPs
- The relevance of the research questions in CoA1 to the overall focus should be reconsidered
- The comparative advantage of the CGIAR relative to other organizations needs to be clearly articulated – recognition of property rights and local institutions as mediators of restoration could be more explicit
- The geography of site selection should also be reassessed.

Flagship 5: Sustainable Global Value Chains and Investments for Supporting Forest Conservation and Equitable Development [Rating: B]

FP5 has high strategic relevance from a forest perspective and is much more focussed than in Phase I, but relative importance/magnitudes of links to the IDOs/SLOs is less clear. The geographic focus of FP5 seems driven by this (admittedly innovative) approach to what is a fairly orthodox interpretation of the global forest domain; but how this maps into significant prospects for impacts on IDOs/SLOs is unclear raising questions on CGIAR comparative advantage. There are strong possibilities for linkage with FP3 here (this may enable FP3 sub-IDO/IDO delivery) as well other FPs. The three CoAs, namely, governance arrangements for sustainable commodity supply; inclusive business models in global value chains; and, responsible investment are interesting and fit together conceptually. However, the ToC resembles a log frame of plausible impact pathways combined with aspirational statements and rationalizing assumptions. Overall, one can infer that information is the key constraint and many 'win-win' options for business are waiting to be discovered and replicated. Inclusion of political economy analysis (consideration of power and political dynamics) is needed to strengthen this argument. For instance, it cannot be assumed that corporate groups (along the value chain or in financial services industry) will act on research results. FTA should also examine if it has sufficient finance and business modelling expertise to produce IPGs in CoAs 5.2 and 5.3 (is this vis-à-vis collaboration with PIM?). While there is evidence of

lessons learned, Phase I did not produce more fundamental insights. This does raise questions about the potential for IPGs from this approach in Phase II.

Additional comments that may assist in drafting CoAs in Phase II follow. In CoA 5.2, how does one know that there is a future for “resource poor” SMEs in these value chains, which, if they involve processing, often are capital intensive and characterized by economies of scale? At the very least, some sort of financial and economic feasibility studies would seem to be a necessary (and prudent) step before other research activities commence in full flow. And in the case of CoA 5.3, what evidence is there for the claim of “proliferation of sustainable and inclusive business models” that seems to underpin the idea that these will be picked up by companies interested in socially and environmentally “responsible investment”? Perhaps there have been many successful pilots, but have any of these grown to significant scale relative to the total turnover in these commodity markets? This may be worth exploring, but the risk of not achieving transformational impacts remains and is worth assessing.

In relation to partnerships, while there are strong linkages with PIM and CCAFS, there are questions on what other key partners will contribute. The commitment to gender research appears strong, but not much evidence on activities in Phase I is provided. More importantly, the attention to the enabling environment is surprisingly weak, considering the focus of the FP.

Flagship 6: Landscape dynamics, productivity and resilience [Rating: A]

Through this Flagship, the CRP aims to understand the patterns of change, the consequences for ecosystem services supporting production systems, and the diversity and governance of landscapes. Together with FPs 2, 3 and 5, this Flagship is a critical part of the core of the FTA pre-proposal. The description of general lessons learned demonstrates that, despite the significant legacy of past research, FP6 has the potential to break important new ground in Phase II: despite the advocacy of landscape approaches by FTA partners and others, there is a significant research and evidence gap. CoA 6.1 on current patterns and intensities of change in tree cover seems highly pertinent (and given its observatory role, attention on open access and data management should be addressed in the full proposal). But, while the lessons learned are suggestive of hypotheses, FP6 would benefit from a clearer, complete elaboration of a ToC: even if assumptions associated with the ToC can be inferred from the diagram, it is not clearly stated and would be useful in framing the RiD priorities. RiD seems highly relevant to all CoAs in this Flagship, but is only mentioned in CoA 6.3. FTA also needs to explicitly identify the (potential) unintended consequences of its work.

FP6 does have a strong track record; and, a strong research team and partnerships (A4NH, PIM, WLE, and FutureEarth). There is a much clearer rationale for sentinel sites (compared to Phase I), including link to IDOs/SLOs. FP6 has a clear comparative advantage in terms of research. The FP adequately addresses gender issues, but could improve consideration of capacity development and enabling environment. FP6 receives 15% of the overall budget, and while potential to leverage bilateral funding sources is indicated, given FP6’s design, centrality to FTA, and the integrated delivery with WLE, A4NH and PIM, it appears to merit priority for W1/2.

Flagship 7: Forests & climate change [Rating: B]

Considering the centrality of FT&A systems to climate change issues, FP7 will research policies and technologies for mitigation, adaptation and sustainable bioenergy provision, and their implementation within climate-smart landscapes. This Flagship is strategically relevant and involves a close and complementary collaboration with CCAFS. While the integration of research

activities on mitigation with activities on adaptation, and the addition of biofuel-related research makes sense conceptually, it broadens the scope substantially – is the potential for IPG delivery diluted? Specifically, in CoA 7.1, apart from prospects for climate change mitigation, provision of IPGs through advancing knowledge isn't entirely clear; in CoA 7.2, the hypotheses being tested are not apparent, and FTA will need to make a better case for why “case studies” are the best way to understand adaptation. In particular, how will these lead to IPGs; and, in CoA 7.3, that aims to analyse “the climate benefits of growing tree-based bioenergy, and of national and international policies governing tree-/biomass-based energy policies”, it is not apparent why these activities are placed in FP7 and not FP3 or even FP2. For a Flagship that includes work on mitigation and low emissions development, the enabling environment is not sufficiently considered. For instance, it is not obvious that there is (currently) sufficient incentive for smallholders to engage in mitigation activities: what are the prospects for farmers to significantly benefit from these activities? If an international agreement does not emerge in the forthcoming UNFCCC Conference of Parties (CoP), do the various partial approaches constitute sufficient financial resources and good prospects for this line of research to produce significant development impacts? Finally, gender and youth are dealt with at a high-level, and the outcomes do seem ambitious.