

Summary Report

Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR Research

Volume I of the Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR

APRIL 2017



Sally Baden (Team Leader)
Lynn Brown
Rachel Percy
Federica Coccia (IEA)



Independent
Evaluation
Arrangement

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR.

The Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR is the first independent, system-wide evaluation of gender in the CGIAR. It is one of three, cross cutting, thematic evaluations commissioned by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) in 2016.

The Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR covers both gender in research and gender at the workplace. The two dimensions were evaluated using different methodologies, and the results are published in two separate volumes of the Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR, Volume I on Gender in CGIAR Research and Volume II on Gender at the workplace.

This is the Summary Report of the Evaluation of CGIAR Gender - Volume I of the Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR. The main report will be made public once the management response becomes available.

The Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR encourages fair use of this material provided proper citation is made.

Correct citation: CGIAR-IEA (2017), Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR – Volume I, Evaluation of Gender in Research. Summary Report. Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR
<http://iea.cgiar.org/>

BACKGROUND, CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

Women comprise nearly half of the world's agricultural labour force, but have unequal access to economic opportunities and reap less benefits than men from their participation. Besides limiting women's realisation of their potential, persistent gender gaps in access to resources and markets and in decision making are widely understood in the Agricultural Research for Development community (AR4D) as a constraint on overall agricultural productivity and growth and as factors contributing to the persistence of hunger and under-nutrition. Conversely, increased incomes in the hand of women, and their greater control of assets, are linked with improvements in their decision-making power, increased productivity, improved food security and better nutritional outcomes. Meanwhile, gender based preferences alongside gender based social norms, are increasingly understood to shape processes of technological change in agriculture.

The CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) 2010-15 identifies gender inequality as a critical area that directly affects CGIAR's likelihood of success in reducing rural poverty, increasing food security, improving nutrition and health and the sustainable management of natural resources, and highlights the importance of empowering women to achieving these development objectives. The SRF 2016-2030 makes an explicit commitment to tackle gender equity throughout the CGIAR, including by '*closing the gender gap in equitable access to resources, information and power in the agri-food system by 2030*'. Women feature as 50 percent of the targets for 2010-15 SRF system level outcomes and there is also a specific target to reduce women's micronutrient malnutrition. Additionally, '*gender and inclusive growth*' is one of eight strategic research priority areas.

These commitments build on an earlier history of CGIAR research on gender issues in farming systems and of gender analysis of intra-household dynamics, as well as initiatives designed to enhancing the representation of women among scientists. This most recent phase of gender mainstreaming was launched by the adoption of the first Consortium Level Gender Strategy (CLGS) by the Consortium Board in September 2011, with two pillars, gender in CGIAR research and gender and diversity in the CGIAR workplace.

EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODS

Evaluation purpose and audience

The Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR is the first independent, system-wide evaluation of gender in the CGIAR. It is one of three, cross cutting, thematic evaluations commissioned by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) in 2016. The main purposes of this Evaluation are:

- › **accountability** to the CGIAR system as a whole on progress at system, Center, and CRP levels: in developing appropriate gender strategies in pursuit of the objectives contained in the SRFs; integrating gender analysis in their research and engaging in appropriate gender research and impact analysis; and in achieving gender equity and inclusiveness at the workplace;
- › **identification of lessons learnt and formulation of recommendations** that will enhance the capability of the CRPs and the System as a whole to make research more gender-sensitive, promote gender equity and enhance research effectiveness, and making the CGIAR a gender-responsive/sensitive workplace.

Stakeholders for this evaluation are: the System Council, the System Management Board (SMB), the Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC), Centers and their Boards, CRP management and staff, the Gender and Agricultural Research Network, and CGIAR partners and beneficiaries. The CRP and Center Management will have primary responsibility to follow up on recommendations at CRP and Center levels, while decisions and Recommendations targeting the System will be the responsibility of the System Council (upon recommendations of the SMB).

Evaluation scope and questions

The *Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR* was originally conceived as a single evaluation covering both gender in research and gender at the workplace. It was later recognized that these two dimensions, although contributing to the common objective of gender equity, relate to a distinct set of issues and actors, with different impact pathways making it conceptually difficult to treat them together. The two dimensions were therefore evaluated using different methodologies, and the results are published in two separate volumes of the Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR, Volume I on Gender in CGIAR Research and Volume II on Gender at the workplace. The two evaluations were conducted in parallel and findings and information exchanged at key times during the evaluation process, leading to the formulation of a common recommendation (Recommendation 1 of both Volume I and Volume II of the *Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR*).

The Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR Research is focused around four dimensions:

- › Gender strategies and system level accountability
- › Gender mainstreaming in research
- › Gender research
- › Gender capacity and expertise

This Evaluation is primarily focused on the period of the first round of CRPs (2011-16). Nevertheless, in order to better target key evaluation recommendations, the Evaluation also takes into account the new framework of the second phase CRPs and substantial changes to the overall governance architecture of CGIAR during 2016.

Evaluation approach and methodology

Building on existing IEA CRP evaluations and on earlier internal reviews of gender mainstreaming in CGIAR, the Evaluation employed a range of tools and methods to assess progress. These included: a total of 71 key informant interviews at both system and CRP levels, extensive review of CGIAR documents, meeting minutes, annual monitoring reports and data; a comparative assessment of CRP gender strategies; a review of selected CRP gender research outputs including journal articles, guidelines and manuals; and bibliometric analysis of gender research articles. Gender capacity and expertise were analyzed through a survey of Gender Research Coordinators, and analysis of the composition of the CGIAR Gender and Agricultural Research Network. The perspectives of partners on CGIAR gender research were gathered through a survey of members of the Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP).

The Evaluation team also conducted four qualitative case studies of CRPs for the Gender in Research component (FTA, GRISP, PIM and RTB) selected based on perceptions of their relative progress in the evaluation period, to draw out lessons on 'what works'. Within these CRPs, 'successful' projects were also examined. Although chosen to include the different 'types' of CRP, the case studies are not representative of CRPs as a whole or directly comparable.

MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

CGIAR System level commitment to gender equity has moved forward significantly since 2010, albeit slowly, and under pressure from key System donors. The requirement of the CLGS for the CRPs to develop gender strategies and related system requirements to develop gender specific plans and budgets, with associated targets, has provided both incentives and an accountability framework for gender mainstreaming in CRPs. In tandem with this, the appointment of Gender Research Coordinators in each CRP to lead the gender strategies, supported by a Senior Gender Advisor at system level, and the wider Gender Network has provided the capacity to move the process forward. Leadership at CRP level, and donor interest in gender mainstreaming in CGIAR have been additional enabling factors. Meanwhile, System level action on gender at the workplace has stalled and requires concerted attention. (See Volume II of this Evaluation on Gender at the workplace for more details and recommendations).

Gender mainstreaming in CGIAR research has advanced in most CRPs since the beginning of the evaluation period, albeit at varying speeds and from very different starting points. Gender is now considered more widely than previously in CGIAR research, among senior managers, plant breeders, and other social scientists. Notably:

- › progress in many CRPs in extending sex disaggregated data collection, and in integrating gender into baseline and impact assessment survey tools, which will enable more systematic assessment of gender-disaggregated or related outcomes and impacts across a variety of sites within the next 2-3 years;
- › a number of CRPs now systematically monitoring gender mainstreaming across their whole portfolio (see chapter 4);
- › a qualitative advance in the integration of gender in the design of the second round of CRPs, compared to the first round, with some emerging, promising impact pathways (see chapter 4).
- › the groundwork has been laid for more systematic and effective integration of gender in CGIAR research during period of the Phase II CRPs.

Gender specific research has also played a significant role in contributing to 'mainstreaming' both in the CGIAR System and externally, through a variety of analytical and methodological tools and frameworks, and associated capacity building, as well as potentially contributing to intermediate development outcomes in its own right. The growth in investment in **gender specific research** is reflected in a significant increase in published outputs from CGIAR gender specific research: in 2012, only six CRPs published (22) peer reviewed journal articles; in 2015 all CRPs published (87) journal articles that were outputs of gender research (see chapter 3).

This points to the importance of both capitalizing on earlier investments, and of further investing in, strategic, gender specific research. New challenges for gender research are also emerging, including the importance of addressing gender in a wider framework of intersectionality alongside age (along with socio-economic class and caste or ethnicity, depending on the context), which require investment in new analytical and methodological tools.

Significant heterogeneity in capacity - and to some extent commitment - on gender in CGIAR research remains. While some CRPs have 'mainstreamed' gender across most flagships to a significant degree, others have reached an estimated quarter of their portfolio. The growth in volume and diversity of gender research outputs, with a broader range of CRPs now producing and publishing some gender research, is encouraging, but has also brought greater variability in its quality. Meanwhile, there is a lack of shared understanding of what constitutes high quality 'gender expertise' or gender research, and in some CRPs the quality of gender-specific research is limited by the lack of (senior) gender scientist capacity - in addition to wider social scientific capacity.

The across CRP (and Center) variability reflects that the process of institutional mainstreaming is ongoing, and incentives, accountability systems, resources and networks are needed to retain the growing momentum. At the same time, and given the evolving institutional and funding context, both across the system as a whole, and within CRPs, clearer prioritization of investments in gender research, and more focused efforts at integrating gender in research, are needed that take into account heterogeneity in capacities and priorities.

The following subsections present further detailed findings and conclusions under the main evaluation sub-headings, followed by an overview of the Evaluation recommendations.

System level decisions and accountability

The CLGS has achieved its purpose of catalysing CRP gender strategies and system level mainstreaming towards greater equity, but it is not sufficiently aligned to the 2016-30 SRF, and nor does it provide a clear accountability framework or 'road map' for Gender in CGIAR Research and at the workplace, given the new governance structure. Renewed system level leadership and an updated framework are needed that reflect a clear system level commitment on both gender in CGIAR research and at the workplace, embodying the value given to gender as a critical element of quality of research, as well as gender diversity and equity in organizational effectiveness (See **Recommendations 1 and 2**; and Volume II of the Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR for further recommendations on gender at the workplace).

Overall, system level accountability in the new structure lies with the SMB, with CRPs and Centers accountable to this body, which suggests an ongoing need for reporting on gender equity and diversity from CRPs and Centers to SMB (see **Recommendation 2**). The existing system for monitoring gender mainstreaming across CGIAR has kept gender issues on the agenda and enabled tracking of progress in mainstreaming at high level, serving an accountability function of CRPs and Centers to the wider Consortium and its funders. However, it has been much less effective at ensuring accountability on delivery. There is a need to re-balance Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) efforts on gender towards capturing the uptake and effectiveness of gender research as well as its contribution to outcomes.

The existing reporting system is heavy: gender (as well as wider) indicators are output focused, overlapping, inconsistently applied and (thus) not readily comparable. Progress achieved during 2011-16 also means that the benchmarks for existing annual reporting indicators on gender mainstreaming no longer provide an effective measure. As such, the monitoring system is not efficient and needs to be revised. The current development of the CGIAR Performance Management System provides an opportunity to address some of the challenges in monitoring on gender, building on current best practice, while streamlining monitoring and reporting at different levels (see **Recommendations 9 and 10**).

CRP Gender strategies

CRP Gender Strategies have played a catalytic role in getting gender onto the CRP agenda, especially where Lead Centers did not have established capacity in gender or social science research. However, gender strategies were ambitious and difficult to fulfil, given that available resources for CRPs, did not meet expectations.

Going forward, CRP Gender strategies need to provide greater clarity about their approach to achieving gender - and wider - equity based on their focus, operating context and capacities, while seeking to work in 'transformative' ways where possible. They can also be more explicit on the appropriate balance of effort and investment between gender specific research, capacity building and mainstreaming (or integration of gender) and across different flagships (see **Recommendation 5**).

Relevance and Quality of CGIAR Gender Research

RELEVANCE

Overall, CGIAR gender research is strongly aligned with the gender IDO and sub-IDO priorities, while also responding to growing concerns in the AR4D community (e.g. the work on gender norms) reflecting clear areas of comparative advantage - and demand - for CGIAR gender research built up over many years. These include: the development of innovative gender related data collection tools and analysis methods; intra-household decision making; gender in food security and nutrition and health; gender, decision making and governance in natural resources management; and gender aspects of climate smart agriculture and climate policy processes. Cross-country analysis and interdisciplinary work between social and natural scientists on technological change are also important areas of comparative advantage of CGIAR gender research, which merit further investment with a greater emphasis on mixed methods. Meanwhile, CGIAR gender research is evolving with a more nuanced understanding of gender research needs, e.g. on 'jointness' in household decision making and gender equity in rural transformation.

QUALITY

High quality gender research is essential to credibility in strategic partnerships that can enhance uptake and leverage the CGIAR's comparative advantage on gender in AR4D. A few Centers have historically been leaders in gender research, and this continues to be reflected in the fields of research perceived to reflect CGIAR comparative advantage, in the distribution of publications and in citations. In the last 2-3 years, a wider range of CRPs have demonstrated capacity to produce high quality, widely cited gender research outputs. However, significant variability in quality of gender research is apparent, underlining the importance of disseminating tried and tested frameworks, tools and standards, of continued investment in both capacity building, and cross CRP collaboration to maintain the overall quality (see **Recommendations 7 and 11**).

UPTAKE

Strategic partnerships are critical for gender research uptake, as is the development and dissemination of a comprehensive range of outputs, and investment in outreach, training and research communications. Involving partners in early stages of research and maintaining ongoing collaboration and engagement in external processes are also promising strategies for enhancing the relevance and uptake of gender research. A few CRPs are regularly solicited to engage in external processes or to conduct gender research. In general, however, investing in outreach and uptake, and tracking usage of gender research outputs appears relatively limited and requires more attention. A lot of gender research has, in the first instance, been focused on internal users in the context of gender mainstreaming. Even here, though, tracking of usage could be more systematic (e.g. CRP use of the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index - WEAI) (see **Recommendation 10**).

Gender in CGIAR Research

GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN THE RESEARCH CYCLE

Annual reporting from CRPS suggests that on most indicators there is improvement in gender mainstreaming (e.g. in terms of technologies, or tools targeted at women as well as men farmers, or assessed for likely gender differentiated impacts). The extent to which gender is 'mainstreamed' is still, at face value, highly variable ranging between 25 and 50 percent of projects which have gender significantly or fully mainstreamed.

Gender analysis is better integrated into theories of change and impact pathways, in at least some Phase II CRPs. However, using gender analysis to inform overall priority setting remains a key challenge,

alongside monitoring and evaluation of gender-related or gender-differentiated outcomes. In order to focus resources where investment can have most leverage, CRPs need to adopt a more systematic approach to prioritising and designing gender research, building on the good practice of A4NH for example, which developed an overarching analytical framework to guide gender research efforts. In developing theories of change and impact pathways, gender researchers also need to consider potential trade-offs between different outcomes, and key risks and assumptions related to gender.

Targeting is also a challenge: there remains a tendency to set aspirational targets (e.g. 30 percent, or 50 percent women) based on assumptions or historical practice and to target women as a category with insufficient analysis of the context. CRPs need to more rigorously use gender and wider socio-economic analysis to set targets, to assess how age, class - and other 'intersectionalities' - might affect outcomes for different groups women as well as men.

Gender-specific research has significantly contributed to the mainstreaming of gender in wider CRP research (as well as externally) through tools and frameworks and associated capacity building. The historically 'leading' Centers on gender have played a key role in development of gender tools and frameworks, with other CRPs as well as external partners collaborating on their use and adoption. There is thus a clear rationale for ensuring sufficient resources are focused on gender-specific research given its importance both to effective mainstreaming as well as to gender equity outcomes. For those CRPs with more limited resources, and capacities, however, investments in gender specific research will benefit from collaboration with other CRPs with shared interests and more experience, and/or with specialist strategic partners.

CONTRIBUTION OF GENDER RESEARCH TO OUTCOMES

Many gender strategies have only been effectively implemented since 2013, and CRP Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment (MEIA) frameworks, in many instances, were developed later so there is as yet limited systematic data to track the outcomes of gender mainstreaming and gender research. The Evaluation finds some patchy but promising evidence of how gender research is contributing to immediate outcomes or behaviour changes, such as women engaging in processes of resource management at local level, and changes in development practitioners and policy makers thinking about women's empowerment. Baseline surveys incorporated gender related indicators were conducted in some CRPs between 2012 and 2014 and wider evidence on the outcomes to which gender research is contributing, should become available within the next 1-3 years, as data becomes available from endline or follow up surveys. Joint investments of CRPs with SPIA on assessing impact e.g. of technology adoption on gender equity and empowerment outcomes, for example, could yield important insights.

In the meantime, investing more systematically in tracking and assessing the contribution of CGIAR gender research to behaviour change is critical to understanding the impact pathways for gender research. These impact pathways may be through the uptake of specific tools and approaches among wider CGIAR scientists (**see Recommendation 10**).

CROSS CRP COLLABORATION AND LEARNING

A few CRPs – notably PIM, CCAFS – enabled by the Gender Network have played an important role in fostering collaboration on gender research and promoting the adoption of new tools and methods for gender research, notably on value chains and climate change. External partnerships and funding have also been key enablers of more formal collaboration, alongside longstanding professional relationships between leading gender researchers and Centers. Ensuring consistency in methodologies across programmes and sites, enabling data sharing and joint publications are key aspects of successful collaboration. There is significant potential to further strengthen cross CRP collaboration on gender, e.g. through joint research, or capacity building of partners in key sites, or on joint impact assessment (**see Recommendation 2 and 11**).

Gender Capacity and Expertise

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND RESOURCES AT SYSTEM LEVEL

System level institutional capacity on gender during 2012-16 was insufficient to support a major process of institutionalising of gender in research. The Senior Gender Advisor (SGA) role was also perceived as conflating advisory and accountability functions. The ISPC role is critical in ensuring gender is addressed systematically as a quality of research, as well as inclusion, issues, across its different functions. The new Collaborative Platform for Gender Research presents important opportunities to strengthen gender in CGIAR research, and specifically to raise the relevance, quality and visibility – along with support for - CGIAR gender research. However, the insufficiency of funding and staffing allocated to the Platform puts in serious question whether it can realistically deliver on a range of expectations across the CGIAR System Organization. There are also risks that subcontracting the Platform to an outside organization reduces its authority and visibility in the system, that the momentum of the gender network is lost in the transition and that the work of the Platform is 'siloes' or dominated by its host CRP, PIM. As of March 2017, there is no plan to replace the outgoing SGA, and it is unclear if there will be any capacity in the System Management Office to support budgeting, monitoring and reporting for the system in general or for gender specifically (see **Recommendation 3**).

RESOURCES FOR GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND GENDER RESEARCH

Gender budget targets have been largely successful in increasing allocations and expenditure for gender work, and have been met by most CRPs. Although to date the share of spending on gender has held up well, in spite of funding cuts, the falling levels of W1/2 resources since 2014 – and the unpredictability of funding, put fragile gains on gender mainstreaming to date at risk. The ten percent budget target can effectively act as a floor, below which CRPs should not drop. However, current guidance for gender budgeting does not form an effective or consistent basis for prioritization (see **Recommendation 4**).

GENDER EXPERTISE

Meanwhile, both the level and composition of gender expertise remain heterogeneous across CRPs. Those that are well resourced with a strong level of senior gender expertise backed by wider social science capacity have – by and large - maintained their capacity while those starting from a weaker base have somewhat increased their capacity. However, some CRPs remain over-reliant on more junior gender specialists, lacking specific technical skills and authority (see **Recommendation 6**).

Several CRPs have struggled to recruit and retain senior level researchers and to maintain continuity in the crucial Gender Research Coordinator (GRC) role, leading to delays in effective implementation of gender strategies and a lack of leadership for strategic gender research. GRCs as well as wider gender team members have been overburdened with a tension in their 'dual' role, and there is a danger that the role undermines career progression (see **Recommendation 7**).

The CGIAR System lacks a common understanding of what constitutes gender expertise, whether of gender specialists or of wider scientists and staff, on gender. Both the network and some CRPs/Centers have invested in developing competency frameworks, which can be usefully consolidated and adapted for wider use in recruitment as well as performance management and development (see **Recommendation 7**).

CAPACITY BUILDING

Gender capacity assessments carried out both at system and CRP levels indicate ongoing gaps in gender skills across the system. This includes gaps among 'gender specialists,' for example on M&E; some gender specialists also lack specialist technical expertise in relevant domains for their CRP.

A number of capacity building initiatives are underway to strengthen gender expertise, taking very

different approaches; none appears to have been formally assessed for their contribution to either individual competencies or institutional capacities. Targeted capacity building and initiatives to foster improved collaboration between gender specialist and other scientists seem the most promising areas; alongside increased support to wider uptake of existing 'tools' for gender research and to mixed methods research on gender (see **Recommendation 8**).

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Evaluation Team recommends that:

◇ Recommendation 1.

System Council adopt an overarching, high-level CGIAR Vision statement on Gender Equity, covering both gender in research and gender at the workplace that would: enshrine the system's commitment to gender equity in its overall scientific endeavour, requiring CRPs to pursue efforts to integrate gender in their research; Centers to promote diversity in their workplace practices; and, provide an overall accountability framework on Gender for different system level entities, Centers and CRPs. System Council to appoint a 'Gender Champion' to lead the development of the vision statement, and to ensure, ongoing, that gender issues in research and at the workplace are kept on the Council's agenda as needed.

◇ Recommendation 2.

To concretise the overarching vision on gender, the SMB should develop and adopt a time bound Policy on Gender in CGIAR Research which sets out expectations and shared commitments of both Centers and CRPs, which would clarify CGIAR's overall approach to gender research in A4RD and common priorities; stipulate commitments of CRPs to joint, interdisciplinary working across CRPs on strategic priorities in gender research; and maintain and develop the gender research skills needed to deliver this, across the system. An SMB 'Gender in Research' champion would lead the development of the Gender in CGIAR Research policy with a small Task Force, which would be approved by SMB and monitored by a light touch set of key performance indicators.

◇ Recommendation 3.

The System Management Board should give consideration to maintaining or strengthening the capacity of System level bodies - notably the System Management Office and the Gender Platform - to be able to carry out their respective budgeting, monitoring and accountability, and learning and coordination functions, within the reformed system, with regard to integrating gender in CGIAR research.

◇ Recommendation 4.

The CGIAR System should maintain its current target of 10 percent for CRP spending on gender as a minimum requirement, while supporting CRPs to use this funding as strategically and effectively as possible, in light of overall funding constraints. To support this, the System Management Board should continue to require submission of separate section on gender in the Programs and working budgets (PoWB) as a condition for approval of funds. These submissions should also clarify sources of funding for gender work and System Management Office – working closely with the Gender Platform – should revise the existing gender budgeting guidelines to ensure funds are most effectively targeted.

◆ Recommendation 5.

CRPs should refresh and refocus their gender strategies and/or future work plans, as relevant, to ensure alignment with priorities in the Gender in CGIAR Research Policy (see Recommendation 2). To support the effective integration of gender in research going forward, GRCs and CRP Gender teams should develop clear frameworks for prioritisation of gender research (e.g. building on the example of A4NH), and work with larger CRP teams to further clarify their overall 'approach' to integrating gender into research, how they will address intersectionality, between gender and wider inclusion issues (e.g. youth/age); and the balance of effort and resources to gender specific and gender mainstreamed research as well as capacity building. All CRPs, where not already in place, should embed systems for monitoring gender research and gender integration in research across their project portfolio, learning from current best practices in PIM, A4NH, FTA etc., and report on implementation of gender strategies to lead Center boards and to Advisory committees (e.g. annually- see also Recommendation 11). The Gender Platform can support CRPs by reviewing updated gender strategies or facilitating peer review as needed; and by providing guidance on addressing intersectionality.

◆ Recommendation 6.

CRPs should protect minimum core capacity/team of 1 senior and 3 other FTE in specialist gender expertise, including GRC, spread across participating Centers, while further exploring innovative ways of sharing resources and bringing in gender expertise through strategic partnerships and bilateral funding. In addition, clusters of CRPs (e.g. *Agrifood systems CRPs, ecosystems CRPs and cross cutting CRPs; or clusters by geography*) should explore options for seconding or jointly 'buying in' additional senior, specialist gender research capacity from within the system or from external partners, to support work on common research priorities. Both CRPs and the Gender Platform should give priority to recruitment of gender post-doctoral Fellows trained by the CGIAR system to longer term positions in CGIAR, e.g. through shared appointments, or to augment the capacity of the newly formed Platform.

◆ Recommendation 7.

CGIAR should strengthen institutional mechanisms to enhance gender capacity and expertise at system, Center and CRP levels, by: developing a common competency framework on gender for different roles, drawing on the existing work of the SGA, the Network and selected CRPs, for use in recruitment and performance development and also as a framework for future initiatives for building gender capacity; institutionalising integrated gender teams across Centers and flagships, under the leadership of the GRC, embedded in CRP management teams; reviewing the scope of the GRC role to ensure sustainability; ensuring that CRP advisory committees and Center Boards have clear ToR and defined capacity among members to provide advice and oversight, respectively, on gender issues in research in relevant domains.

◆ Recommendation 8.

Centers (and CRPs where possible) should invest selectively, and - where appropriate - jointly, in both targeted capacity building of gender specialists in specific technical areas, and capacity building of other scientists to effectively integrate gender into research design, through 'buying in' tailored training in gender capacities from external providers or contracting institutional capacity building through partnerships, for economies of scale. All capacity building should be assessed for effectiveness, and assessment of individual capacity development should refer to the common competencies framework. The Gender Platform supports Center/CRP gender capacity development, by: identifying relevant service providers or partners for institutional capacity or training support; and facilitating cross-system capacity strengthening in core gender thematics, research methods and gender 'tools', drawing on specialist expertise within CGIAR.

◆ **Recommendation 9.**

The System Management Board should request inputs and proposals from the Gender Collaborative Platform to effectively engender the new Performance Management System, working closely with the monitoring, evaluation and learning community of practice (MELCOP) and to develop common standards on gender reporting across CRPs and advise on System-wide indicators and targets for gender and wider outcomes.

◆ **Recommendation 10.**

CRPs should individually and jointly invest in improving and institutionalising systems for monitoring outputs, as well as effectiveness and outcomes of gender research, in particular by: tracking demand for gender research outputs; investing in and monitoring gender research uptake; piloting cross-CRP methods to track research uptake and outcomes; and working with SPIA to identify priorities for cross system impact assessments.

◆ **Recommendation 11.**

The Collaborative Gender Research Platform (Gender Platform) should harness the energy of the gender network, while placing greater emphasis going forward on: **supporting common research priorities; on joint assessment of gender research effectiveness and outcomes/impacts; on fostering interdisciplinary dialogue and collaboration between gender and other researchers through communities of practice; and supporting systematised and well supported roll out of existing tools and methods.** To ensure that the Platform is effective across the whole CGIAR system and in leveraging partnerships, it is important that external bodies, along with the 'range' of CRPs - notably agri-food systems CRPs - as well as Big Data and Excellence in Breeding platforms, are represented in its advisory committee.



For more information, please visit: iea.cgiar.org