



Evaluation of the CGIAR Research Program “Forests, Trees and Agroforestry” (FTA)

Volume II – Annexes

July 2014



Federica Coccia
Andrea Deisenrieder
Marko Katila
Florencia Montagnini
Markus Palenberg (Team Leader)
Carmenza Robledo



Independent
Evaluation
Arrangement

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

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

Correct citation: CGIAR-IEA (2014), Evaluation of CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry (FTA). Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR.
<http://iea.cgiar.org/>

Table of Contents

Annex A. Comprehensive Bibliography	2
Annex B. Persons Consulted	18
Annex C: Short Bios of Evaluation Team Members	28
Annex D. Project Matching and Characterization Analysis.....	32
Analysis procedure	32
Aggregate Analysis Results.....	35
Component Results: Reassign Components	36
Component Results: Which SRF goal does the project contribute to?.....	36
Component Results: Gender	37
Component Results: Sentinel Landscapes	38
Component Results: Capacity Development	39
Component Results: Partnerships.....	40
Component Results: Tenure.....	40
Component Results: Quality of Theory of Change	41
Component Results: Types of Impact Pathways.....	42
Component Results: Impact Assessment	43
Control Question: How adequate was the level of info on the project?.....	43
Annex E. Synthesis of Performance in Achieving 2012 and 2013 Output Targets	44
Annex F. Sample projects overview	45
Annex G. Guidance on governance in the CGIAR context	47
Annex H. Report of the Panel of Experts.....	51

Annex A. Comprehensive Bibliography

- Agarwal, B., 2009. Gender and forest conservation: The impact of women's participation in community forest governance. *Ecological Economics* 68, 2785–2799. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.04.025
- Agarwal, B., 2010a. Does women's proportional strength affect their participation? *Governing local forests in South Asia*. *World development* 38, 98–112.
- Agarwal, B., 2010b. *Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women's Presence Within and Beyond Community Forestry*. Oxford University Press.
- Ajayi, O.C., Place, F., Akinnifesi, F.K., Sileshi, G.W., 2011. Agricultural success from Africa: the case of fertilizer tree systems in southern Africa (Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe). *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 9, 129–136. doi:10.3763/ijas.2010.0554
- Akinnifesi F.K., P. Chirwa, O.C. Ajayi, G. Sileshi, P. Matakala, F. Kwesiga, R. Harawa, W. Makumba, 2008. Contributions of agroforestry research to livelihood of smallholder farmers in southern Africa: Part 1. Taking stock of the adaptation, adoption, and impacts of fertilizer tree options. *Agricultural Journal* 3(1) 58–75.
- Alavalapati, J.R., Shrestha, R.K., Stainback, G.A., Matta, J.R., 2004. Agroforestry development: An environmental economic perspective. *Agroforestry Systems* 61, 299–310.
- Alekseeva, I.G., Lapina, G.P., Tulovskaia, Z.D., Izmailova, V.N., 1975. Structure formation in interphase adsorption layers of lysozyme at liquid boundaries. *Biofizika* 20, 566–569.
- Angelsen, A., 2007. *Forest Cover Change in Space and Time: Combining the Von Thünen and Forest Transition Theories*. World Bank Publications.
- Asaah, E., Jamnadass, R., Kehlenbeck, K., n.d. Diversity of indigenous fruit trees and their contribution to nutrition and livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa: examples from Kenya and Cameroon, in: *Diversifying Food and Diets: Using Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Nutrition and Health*. Earthscan, Routledge, New York, USA, pp. 257–269.
- Banana, A., Mukasa, C., Tibazalika, A., Mohammed, B., Nabirye Muloki, H., Birabwa, B., Mutimukuru-Maravanyika, T., 2011. Adaptive Collaborative Management learning workshop - Proceedings.
- Banana, A.Y., Bukenya, M., Arinaitwe, E., Birabwa, B., Ssekindi, S., 2012. Gender, tenure and community forests in Uganda.
- Barbier, E.B., Burgess, J.C., Grainger, A., 2010. The forest transition: Towards a more comprehensive theoretical framework. *Land Use Policy, Forest transitions Wind power planning, landscapes and publics* 27, 98–107. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.02.001
- Bennett, M., Franzel, S.C., 2009. Can organic and resource-conserving agriculture improve livelihoods?: a meta-analysis and conceptual framework for site-specific evaluation.

World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi.

- Bevege, I., Debela, S., Egger, P., 2006a. Terms of Reference Meta-Review of CGIAR Systemwide and Eco-regional Programs, Annexes.
- Bevege, I., Egger, P., Debela, S., 2006b. Meta-Review of CGIAR Systemwide and Eco-regional Programs.
- Bhagwat, S.A., Willis, K.J., Birks, H.J.B., Whittaker, R.J., 2008. Agroforestry: a refuge for tropical biodiversity? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 23, 261–267.
doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.01.005
- Bioversity International, 2008. Bioversity International - Financial Statements for the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007 Auditor's Report.
- Bioversity International, 2009. Bioversity International - Annual Report 2008.
- Bioversity International, 2010a. 34th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2010b. 35th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2010c. Bioversity International - Annual Report 2009.
- Bioversity International, 2010d. Bioversity International - Financial Statements for the years ended December 31, 2009 and 2008 Auditor's Report.
- Bioversity International, 2010e. The impact of Bioversity International's African Leafy Vegetables programme in Kenya.
- Bioversity International, 2011a. 36th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2011b. 37th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2011c. Bioversity International - Annual Report 2010.
- Bioversity International, 2011d. Bioversity International - Financial Statement for the year ended December 31, 2010 Auditor's Report.
- Bioversity International, 2011e. Bioversity International - Financial Statement for the year ended December 31, 2011 Auditor's Report.
- Bioversity International, 2012a. 38th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2012b. 39th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2012c. 40th Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2012d. Bioversity International - Annual Report 2011.
- Bioversity International, 2013a. 41st Bioversity International BoT Meeting Minutes.
- Bioversity International, 2013b. Bioversity International - Financial Statements 2012 for the year ended December 31, 2012 Auditor's Report.
- Branisa, B., Klasen, S., Ziegler, M., 2013. Gender Inequality in Social Institutions and Gendered Development Outcomes. *World Development* 45, 252–268.
doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.12.003
- Brockhaus, M., Di Gregorio, M., Mardiah, S., 2013. Governing the design of national REDD +: An analysis of the power of agency. *Forest Policy and Economics*.
doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2013.07.003
- Brockhaus, M., Di Gregorio, M., Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S., 2012. Guide for country profiles:

Global Comparative Study on REDD (GCS-REDD) Component 1 on National REDD+ Policies and Processes.

- Brody, A., Demeteriades, J., Esplen, E., 2008. Gender and climate change: mapping the linkages. A scoping study on knowledge and gaps.
- Brown, H.C., 2011. Gender, climate change and REDD+ in the Congo Basin forests of Central Africa. *International Forestry Review*.
- Calle, Z., Murgueitio E., Chará J., Molina C. H., Zuluaga A. F., Calle A., 2013. A Strategy for Scaling-up Intensive Silvopastoral Systems in Colombia *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*. doi:DOI:10.1080/10549811.2013.817338
- Cash, D., Clarck, W., Alcock, F., Dickinson, N., Eckley, N., Jäger, J., 2002. *Salience, Credibility, Legitimacy and Boundaries: Linking Research, Assessment and Decision Making*.
- Castillo, M., Moreno, E., Muller, P., Muller, R., Ocampo, J.C., 2011. *Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) - Workshop report*.
- CGIAR, 2010. *CGIAR Gender Scoping Study*.
- CGIAR, 2006. *Performance Measurement System Summary Report 2006*.
- CGIAR, 2007. *Performance Measurement System Summary Report 2007*.
- CGIAR, 2008. *Executive Council Fourteenth Meeting, Agenda, May 13-14, 2008*.
- CGIAR, 2009. *CGIAR Joint Declaration*.
- CGIAR, 2010. *A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR - 2010*.
- CGIAR, 2011a. *A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR - 2011*.
- CGIAR, 2011b. *CGIAR Research Program 6: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry Program Participant Agreement - ICRAF*.
- CGIAR, 2011c. *Consortium Performance Agreement under the CGIAR Fund - CRP6*.
- CGIAR, 2011d. *Constitution of the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers*.
- CGIAR, 2011e. *Forests, Trees and Agroforestry Program Participant Agreement - CIAT*.
- CGIAR, 2011f. *Joint Agreement between Bioversity International on behalf of the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers, and the Fund Council of the CGIAR Fund, represented by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development - PPA*.
- CGIAR, 2011g. *Program Implementation Agreement CRP6 - Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance between the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (operating under the name of Bioversity International), on behalf of the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers, and The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)*.
- CGIAR, 2011h. *Program Implementation Agreement CRP6 - signature*.
- CGIAR, 2012. *CGIAR Research Program: Forests, Trees and Agroforestry Program Participant Agreement - CIAT Amendment*.
- CGIAR, 2013a. *CRP performance monitoring report 2012*.

- CGIAR, 2013b. ToR - CRP6 Director 2013.
- CGIAR, n.d. Component Coordinator job description- final.
- CGIAR, n.d. ToR - CRP6 Director.
- CGIAR - Independent Science and Partnership Council, 2013. CGIAR System-Level Outcomes (SLOs), their impact pathways and inter-linkages, ISPC White Paper, Working draft, 10th April, 2013.
- CGIAR - Independent Science and Partnership Council, n.d. Strengthening SRF through prioritization.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2010a. Consortium Board Meeting 1-3 March 2010.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2010b. Consortium Board Meeting 23 May - 25 May, 2010.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2010c. Consortium Board Meeting 6 October 2010.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2011a. Consortium Board Meeting 14 February - 15 February 2011.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2011b. Consortium Board Meeting 4 and 5 May, 2011.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2011c. Consortium Board Meeting September 8 & 9, 2011.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2012a. Consortium Board Meeting February 29th - March 1st, 2012.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2012b. Consortium Board Meeting May 23, 2012.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2012c. Consortium Board Meeting, September 27th, 2012.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2013a. Consortium Board Meeting March 5, 2013.
- CGIAR Consortium, 2013b. Governance, Risk and Compliance Committee (GRCC).
- CGIAR Consortium Board, 2011. CGIAR - Consortium Level Gender Strategy.
- CGIAR Consortium Office, 2011. Consortium level monitoring principles.
- CGIAR Consortium Office, 2013a. CRP Portfolio Annual Progress Report (January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012).
- CGIAR Consortium Office, 2013b. Guidance for CRP Second Call DRAFT - Version 2.
- CGIAR Consortium Office, 2013c. The CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework Management Update, 2013-2014.
- CGIAR Fund Governance Framework, 2011.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2010a. #1 - CGIAR Fund Council Inaugural Meeting February 23, 2010.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2010b. #2 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting, July 14 & 16, 2010.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2010c. #3 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting, Nov 1-2, 2010.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2011a. #4 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting April 5-6, 2011.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2011b. #5 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting July 6-8, 2011.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2011c. #6 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting November 8-9, 2011.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2012a. #7 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting March 7-8, 2012.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2012b. #8 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting October 31 and November 1, 2012.
- CGIAR Fund Office, 2013. #9 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting April 25 and 26, 2013.

- CGIAR Fund Office, 2014. #10 - CGIAR Fund Council Meeting November 6 - 7, 2013.
- CGIAR Independent Science and Partnership Council (ISPC), 2011. ISPC Commentary on the CRP-6 Proposal (dated Feb 2011): Forests Trees and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance.
- CGIAR Science Council, 2009. Stripe Review of Social Sciences in the CGIAR.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2006. Eleventh Meeting of the Executive Council, October 17-18, 2006: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2007a. CGIAR Guidelines on Center Governance - Roles, Responsibilities and Accountability of Center Boards.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2007b. Thirteenth Executive Council Meeting, October 16-17, 2007, Rome, Italy: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2007c. Twelfth Executive Council Meeting, May 16-17, 2007: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2008a. Fifteenth Meeting of the Executive Council, October 1-2, 2008, Lisbon, Portugal: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2008b. Fourteenth Executive Council Meeting, May 13-14, 2008, Ottawa, Canada: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2009a. Seventeenth Meeting of the Executive Council, November 3-4, 2009, Rome, Italy.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2009b. Sixteenth Meeting of the Executive Council, June 4-5, 2009, Cali, Colombia: Summary Record of Proceedings.
- CGIAR Secretariat, 2010. CGIAR Business Meeting 2009, Washington, DC, December 8, 2009: Summary Record.
- Chhatre, A., Lakhanpal, S., Larson, A.M., Nelson, F., Ojha, H., Rao, J., 2012. Social safeguards and co-benefits in REDD+: a review of the adjacent possible. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 4, 654–660. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2012.08.006
- CIAT, 2008a. 57th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2008b. 58th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2009a. 59th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2009b. 60th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2010a. 61st CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2010b. 62nd CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2010c. CIAT - Financial Statements December 31, 2009.
- CIAT, 2011a. 63rd CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2011b. 64th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2012a. 65th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2012b. 66th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIAT, 2013a. 67th CIAT BoT Meeting Minutes.

- CIAT, 2013b. CIAT - Financial Statements 31 December, 2012.
- CIAT, n.d. CIAT - Financial Statements December 31, 2011.
- CIFOR, 2008a. A summary of CIFOR's strategy 2008 - 2018. Making a difference for forests and people.
- CIFOR, 2008b. CIFOR's Strategy: 2008-2018 - Making a Difference for Forests and People.
- CIFOR, 2008c. Medium Term Plan: 2009-2011.
- CIFOR, 2009a. 23th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2009b. 24th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2009c. 25th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2009d. CIFOR - Annual Report 2008.
- CIFOR, 2009e. CIFOR - Financial Statements years ended 31 December 2008 and 2007.
- CIFOR, 2009f. Gender, tenure and community forests in Uganda and Nicaragua - Project proposal.
- CIFOR, 2010a. 26th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2010b. 27th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2011a. 28th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2011b. 29th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2011c. CIFOR - Annual Report 2010.
- CIFOR, 2011d. CIFOR - Financial statements Years ended 31 December 2010 and 2009.
- CIFOR, 2011e. Gender, tenure and community forests in Uganda and Nicaragua - Annual progress report 2010.
- CIFOR, 2012a. 30th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2012b. 31st CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2012c. Adapting forests and people to climate change. Conserving ecosystem services that reduce risk to the world's poorest -A framework proposal.
- CIFOR, 2012d. Addressing the gender gap in participation and representation in community forestry. Consolidation of research and action on gender, tenure and community forestry in Uganda and Nicaragua - Proposal to the Austrian Development Agency by CIFOR.
- CIFOR, 2012e. CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry January-June 2012.
- CIFOR, 2012f. CIFOR - Annual Report 2011.
- CIFOR, 2012g. Climate change mitigation. Avoiding deforestation and greenhouse gas emissions, enhancing forest carbon stock - A framework proposal.
- CIFOR, 2012h. Forest, Trees and Agroforestry - Annual Report 2011.
- CIFOR, 2012i. Gender, tenure and community forest in Uganda and Nicaragua - Annual Progress Report 2012.
- CIFOR, 2013a. 32nd CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.

- CIFOR, 2013b. 33th CIFOR BoT Meeting Minutes.
- CIFOR, 2013c. Adaptation of people to climate change in East Africa: Forest based ecosystem services, risk reduction and human well-being (AdaptEA). Project report July 1, 2012 - June 30. 2013.
- CIFOR, 2013d. CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry January-June 2013.
- CIFOR, 2013e. CIFOR - Annual Report 2012.
- CIFOR, 2013f. CIFOR - Financial statements Years ended 31 December 2012 and 2011.
- CIFOR, 2013g. CIFOR's Global Comparative Study on REDD+: Factsheets on research findings and goals. CIFOR Factsheet.
- CIFOR, 2013h. CRP6 performance monitoring report 2012 Forests, Trees and Agroforestry - Annual Progress Report.
- CIFOR, 2013i. Forest, Trees and Agroforestry - Annual Report 2012.
- CIFOR, 2013j. Gender in the CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: A strategy for research and action. Bogor, Indonesia.
- CIFOR, 2013k. Gender, tenure and community forests in Uganda and Nicaragua - Final project report for the Australian developing Agency.
- CIFOR, 2013l. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment Strategy for CRP6 (2012 – 2016) Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance.
- CIFOR, 2014a. CRP6 performance monitoring report 2013 Forest, Trees and Agroforestry - Annual Progress Report.
- CIFOR, 2014b. Forest, Trees and Agroforestry - Annual Report 2013 (Draft).
- CIFOR, n.d. Learning from REDD+: An enhanced comparative analysis. A proposal prepared by CIFOR for submission under CORAD CFI/Funding Scheme for Civil Society 2013 - 2015.
- CIFOR, n.d. ToR - position Description - Christopher Martius.
- CIFOR, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Manuel Guariguata.
- CIFOR, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Pablo Pacheco.
- CIFOR, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Terry Sunderland.
- Clark, W.C., Tomich, T.P., van Noordwijk, M., Guston, D., Catacutan, D., Dickson, N.M., McNie, E., 2011. Boundary work for sustainable development: Natural resource management at the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. doi:10.1073/pnas.0900231108
- Coe, R., Sinclair, F., Barrios, E., 2014. Scaling up agroforestry requires research “in” rather than “for” development.
- Coleman, E.A., Mwangi, E., 2013. Women's participation in forest management: A cross-country analysis. Global Environmental Change 23, 193–205. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.10.005

- Colomer, J., Balinga, M., Zougmore, R., 2013. Initial overview: Joint CRP initiative in Burkina Faso: Individual meetings Mon 9 – Thu 12 and workshop Fri 13 December 2013.
- Committee on Development Effectiveness, 2013. Managing Forest Resources for Sustainable Development - An evaluation of World Bank Group Experience and Draft Management Response.
- Compassion Capital Fund, 2005. Measuring Outcomes.
- Cornwall, A., 2003. Whose Voices? Whose Choices? Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development. *World Development* 31, 1325–1342.
- CRP6, 2012. CRP6 Components Operational Plan Logframes 2012-14.
- CRP6, 2013. CRP6 Components Operational Plan Logframes 2013-15.
- CRP6, 2014. FTA Research Programme: Review and Planning for Phase II Workshop - draft.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2011a. 1st CRP6 Steering Committee meeting 14 February 2011.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2011b. 2nd CRP6 Steering Committee meeting - 08 September 2011.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2012a. 3rd CRP6 Steering Committee meeting - 27 February 2012.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2012b. 4th Steering Committee Meeting Minutes.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2012c. 5th Steering Committee Meeting Minutes.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2013a. 6th CRP6 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes.
- CRP6 Steering Committee, 2013b. 7th Steering Committee Meeting Minutes.
- Danyell, O., n.d. Evergreen Agriculture Highlights.
- Das, N., 2011. Women's dependence on forest and participation in forestry: A case study of joint forest management programme in West Bengal. *Journal of Forest Economics* 17, 67–89. doi:10.1016/j.jfe.2010.09.003
- David A. Raitzer, 2009. Priority Assessment at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR): Confronting the Challenges of a Policy-oriented Natural Resources Management Research Portfolio.
- David A. Raitzer, George W. Norton, 2009. Prioritizing Agricultural Research for Development - Experiences and Lessons.
- Degrande, A., Franzel, S., Siohdjie Yeptiep, Y., Asaah, E., Tsobeng, A., Tchoundjeu, Z., 2012a. Effectiveness of grassroots organisations in the dissemination of agroforestry innovations. *Agroforestry for biodiversity and ecosystem services—science and practice*. InTech, Rijeka 141–164.
- Degrande, A., Tadjou, P., Takoutsing, B., Asaah, E., Tsobeng, A., Tchoundjeu, Z., 2012b. Getting Trees into Farmers' Fields: Success of Rural Nurseries in Distributing High Quality Planting Material in Cameroon. *Small-scale Forestry* 12, 403–420. doi:10.1007/s11842-012-9220-4
- Di Gregorio, M., Brockhaus, M., Cronin, T., Muharrom, E., Santoso, L., Mardiah, S., Büdenbender, M., 2013. Equity and REDD+ in the Media: a Comparative Analysis of

- Policy Discourses. *Ecology and Society* 18. doi:10.5751/ES-05694-180239
- Djouidi, H., Brockhaus, M., 2011. Is adaptation to climate change gender neutral?: Lessons from communities dependent on livestock and forests in northern Mali. *International Forestry Review*.
- Djouidi, H., Brockhaus, M., Peach Brown, H.C., Bandiaky-Badjic, S., 2012. Gender, climate change and women's representation.
- Earl, S., Carden, F., 2002. Learning from complexity: The International Development Research Centre's experience with Outcome Mapping. *Development in Practice* 12, 518–524. doi:10.1080/0961450220149852
- Earl, S., Carden, F., Smutylo, T., 2001. Outcome mapping. Building learning and reflection into development programs. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Cairo, Dakar, Montevideo, Nairobi, New Dehli, Singapore.
- Eisen, J.A., MacCallum, C.I., Neylon, C., 2013. Expert Failure: Re-evaluating Research Assessment. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001677
- European Institute for Gender Equality, 2012. Gender equity and climate change. Review of the Implementation in the EU of area K of the Beijing Platform for Action: Women and the Environment.
- Eyre-Walker, A., Stroletzki, N., 2013. The Assessment of Science: The Relative Merits of Post-Publication Review, the Impact Factor, and the Number of Citations. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001675
- Facheux, C., Franzel, S., Tabuna, H., n.d. Tree crop development potentials in Africa – Towards a more enabling environment.
- FAO Management, 2012. Strategic Evaluation of FAO's role and work in forestry: Management Response (Programme Committee: Hundred and Twelve Session: Rome, 5 - 9 November 2012).
- Fine, D.P., 1975. Pneumococcal type-associated variability in alternate complement pathway activation. *Infect. Immun.* 12, 772–778.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2010. Global forest resources assessment 2010: Main report. Rome.
- Fowler, N.O., McCall, D., Chou, T.C., Holmes, J.C., Hanenson, I.B., 1976. Electrocardiographic changes and cardiac arrhythmias in patients receiving psychotropic drugs. *Am. J. Cardiol.* 37, 223–230.
- Franzel S., G.L. Denning, J-P. Lillesø-Barnekow, A.R. Mercado, 2004. Scaling up the impact of agroforestry: Lessons from three sites in Africa and Asia. *World Agroforestry Centre, Kenya and the Philippines. Agroforestry Systems* 61-62(1-3) 329–344.
- FTA, 2011. CGIAR Research Program 6 - Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance Proposal.
- FTA, 2012. FTA Component 5 - Progress to Impact PPT.
- FTA, 2013. Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA): Governance, Livelihoods and Landscapes - 10 pager.

- FTA, n.d. Component Coordinator TOR.
- GlobeScan, 2013. 2012 CGIAR Stakeholder Perceptions Survey Final Internal Report, Presentation.
- Godfrey, J., Perset, E., 2012. Principles and Practice of Good Governance - Presentation.
- Higman, S., 2011. Exploring the pathway: An evaluation of the influence of Forest Day. CIFOR.
- Hogarth, N.J., Belcher, B., Campbell, B., Stacey, N., 2013. The Role of Forest-Related Income in Household Economies and Rural Livelihoods in the Border-Region of Southern China. *World Development* 43, 111–123. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.10.010
- IEG Evaluation, 2013. Managing Forest Resources for Sustainable Development - An Evaluation of World Bank Group Experience - Management Response.
- IEG World Bank/IFC/MIGA, 2013. Managing Forest Resources for Sustainable Development - An Evaluation of World Bank Group Experience.
- Independent Evaluation Arrangement, 2012. CGIAR Standards for Independent External Evaluation - Annex (Draft).
- Independent Evaluation Arrangement, 2013a. Evaluation of the CGIAR Research Program “Forests, Trees and Agroforestry” (FTA) - Inception Report.
- Independent Evaluation Arrangement, 2013b. Evaluation of the CGIAR Research Program “Forests, Trees and Agroforestry” (FTA)- Inception Report Annex.
- Independent Evaluation Group, 2007. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs.
- Independent Science and Partnership Council, 2012. Strengthening Strategy and Results Framework through prioritization.
- International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), 2010. IUFRO - Strategy 2010-2014.
- iSC Secretariat, 2002. Lessons learned in the Implementation of Systemwide Programmes iSC Perspectives.
- Jackson, C., 1993. Doing What Comes Naturally? Women and Environment in Development. *World Development* 21, 1947–1963.
- Jagger, P., Sills, E., Lawlor, K., Sunderlin, W., 2010. A guide to learning about livelihood impacts of REDD+. CIFOR Occasional Paper.
- Kabwe, G., 2010. Uptake of agroforestry technologies among smallholder farmers in Zambia.
- Kassam, A.H., Gregersen, H.M., Fereres, E., Javier, E.Q., Harwood, R.R., De Janvry, A., Cernea, M.M., 2004. A framework for enhancing and guarding the relevance and quality of science: The case of the CGIAR. *Experimental Agriculture* 40, 1–21.
- Kauck, D., Paruzzolo, S., Schulte, J., 2010. CGIAR Gender Scoping Study. International Center for Research on Women - ICRW -, Washington, D.C. USA.
- Korhonen-Kurki, K., Brockhaus, M., Duchelle, A.E., Atmadja, S., Thu Thuy, P., Schofield, L., 2013. Multiple levels and multiple challenges for measurement, reporting and verification of REDD+. *International Journal of the Commons* 7, 344–366.

- Lambin, E.F., Turner, B.L., Geist, H.J., Agbola, S.B., et al, 2001. The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths.
- Larson, A.M., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W.D., Duchelle, A., Babon, A., Dokken, T., Pham, T.T., Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Selaya, G., Awono, A., Huynh, T.-B., 2013. Land tenure and REDD+: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Global Environmental Change* 23, 678–689. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.02.014
- Larson, A.M., Corbera, E., Cronkleton, P., Dam, C. van, Bray, D., Estrada, M., May, P., Medina, G., Navarro, G., Pacheco, P., 2010. Rights to forests and carbon under REDD+ initiatives in Latin America. *CIFOR Infobrief*.
- Letter of Agreement LOA - General Terms and Conditions - Annex 2, 2013.
- Lukuyu, B., Place, F., Franzel, S., Kiptot, E., 2012. Disseminating Improved Practices: Are Volunteer Farmer Trainers Effective? *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 18, 525–540. doi:10.1080/1389224X.2012.707066
- Mairota, P., Cafarelli, B., Boccaccio, L., Leronna, V., Labadessa, R., Kosmidou, V., Nagendra, H., 2013. Using landscape structure to develop quantitative baselines for protected area monitoring. *Ecological Indicators, Biodiversity Monitoring* 33, 82–95. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.08.017
- Mamo, A., Argaw, M., n.d. The Impact of Farmland Enclosure on Soil Quality and Sustainability of Conservation Structures: The Case of Hadequlele Initiative, East Shoa Zone.
- Manfre, C., Rubin, D., 2012. Integrating gender into forestry research. A guide for CIFOR scientist and programme administrators.
- Mather, A. S., 2009. The forest transition.
- Mather, A. S., Needle, C. L., 1998. The forest transition: a theoretical basis.
- McAllister, E., 2008. Bringing together the best of science and the best of development – Independent Review of the CGIAR System.
- Meijaard, E., Achdiawan, R., Wan, M., Puntodewo, A., Taber, A., 2011. Impact of CIFOR’s Rattan Research.
- Meijaard E., Sheil D., n.d. Review and Synthesis on Long-Term Experiment Networks.
- Meinzen-Dick R., Jain D., Di Tommaso M.L., 2012. Review of Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women’s Presence Within and Beyond Community Forestry, by Bina Agarwal. Oxford University Press 141–143.
- Mekuria, M., La Rovere, R., Szonyi, J.A., 2008. External review and impact assessment of the African highlands initiative (AHI). Program evaluation report.
- Montagnini F., Campos J. J., Cornelius J., Finegan B., Guariguata M., Marmillod D., Mesén F., Ugalde L., 2002. Environmentally-friendly forestry systems in Central America. *Bois et Forêts des Tropiques* 272(2).
- Mott, C.S., House, C., Family, C., Fund, F.C.G., Monitor, F., n.d. Statements of activities. *Management* 5, 19–037.
- Mukasa, C., Tibazalika A., Mango, A., Muloki, H., 2012a. Gender and forestry in Uganda:

- Policy, legal and institutional frameworks - Policy brief. Policy Brief 53.
- Mukasa, C., Tibazalika, A., Mango, A., Muloki, H., 2012b. Gender and forestry in Uganda: Policy, legal and institutional frameworks.
- Mwangi, E., 2013. Sitting beneath the canopy. Messages on gender, participation and community forestry. Proceeding IUFRO 3 in Fukuoka, Japan.
- Mwangi, E., Meinzen-Dick, R., Sun, Y., 2011. Gender and sustainable forest management in East Africa and Latin America. *Ecology and Society* 16(1): 17.
- Noordwijk, M. van, Agus, F., Dewi, S., Purnomo, H., n.d. Reducing emissions from land use in Indonesia: motivation, policy instruments and expected funding streams. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 1–16. doi:10.1007/s11027-013-9502-y
- OECD, 2011. *Towards Green Growth*.
- Ozgediz, S., 2012. *The CGIAR at 40: Institutional Evolution of the World's Premier Agricultural Research Network*.
- Palenberg, Markus, Institute for Development Strategy, 2008a. *Cross-Cutting Lessons Learned on Challenge Program Governance*, Presentation.
- Palenberg, Markus, Institute for Development Strategy, 2008b. *Cross-Cutting observations based on the review of three CGIAR Challenge Programs*.
- Palenberg, Markus, Institute for Development Strategy, 2011. *Tools and Methods for Evaluating the Efficiency of Development Interventions*.
- Parris, T.M., 2005. Gender and Sustainable Development. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 47, 3–3. doi:10.3200/ENVT.47.7.3-7
- Pasiecznik, N., Higman, S., 2012. *Assessing the influence of Forest Day 5*. CIFOR.
- Pérez del Castillo, Carlos (CGIAR Consortium Board), 2011. Consortium Board approval letter on CRP 6 “Forest and Trees: livelihoods, landscapes and governance.”
- Perz, S.G., 2007. Grand Theory and Context-Specificity in the Study of Forest Dynamics: Forest Transition Theory and Other Directions. *The Professional Geographer* 59, 105–114. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00594.x
- Place, F., 2009. *The impact of fodder trees on milk production, and income among smallholder dairy farmers in East Africa, and the role of research*. World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi.
- Planning, Monitoring and Learning Framework, 2013.
- Plucinski, T., Baldwin, R.L., 1976. Effects of adrenalectomy and glucocorticoid therapy on enzyme activities in mammary and adipose tissues from lactating rats. *J. Dairy Sci.* 59, 157–160. doi:10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(76)84170-7
- Pramova, E., Locatelli, B., Djoudi, H., Somorin, O.A., 2012. Forests and trees for social adaptation to climate variability and change. *WIREs Clim Change* 3, 581–596. doi:10.1002/wcc.195
- Puri, S, Nair, PKR, 2004. Agroforestry research for development in India: 25 years of experiences of a national program. *Agroforestry Systems* 61 437–452.
- Raitzer, D.A., Center for International Forestry Research, 2008. *Assessing the impact of*

- CIFOR's influence on policy and practice in the Indonesian pulp and paper sector. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Raitzer, D.A., Kelley, T.G., 2008a. Assessing the contribution of impact assessment to donor decisions for international agricultural research. *Research Evaluation* 17, 187–199.
- Raitzer, D.A., Kelley, T.G., 2008b. Benefit–cost meta-analysis of investment in the International Agricultural Research Centers of the CGIAR. *Agricultural Systems* 96, 108–123. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2007.06.004
- Raitzer, D.A., Ryan, J.G., 2008. State of the art in impact assessment of policy-oriented international agricultural research. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice* 4, 5–30.
- Rassman, K., Smith, R., Mauremootoo, J., Wilson-Grau, R., 2013. Retrospective “Outcome harvesting”: Generating robust insights about a global voluntary environmental network.
- Renkow, M., Byerlee, D., 2010. The impacts of CGIAR research: A review of recent evidence. *Food Policy* 35, 391–402. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.04.006
- Robertson, S., 2012. Social Metrics, Outcomes Evaluation and Social Return on Investment.
- Rocheleau D., Edmunds D., 1997. Women, men and trees: Gender, power and property in forest and agrarian landscapes. *World Dev.* 25 1351–1371.
- Romijn, E., Herold, M., Kooistra, L., Murdiyarso, D., Verchot, L., 2012. Assessing capacities of non-Annex I countries for national forest monitoring in the context of REDD+. *Environmental Science & Policy* 19–20, 33–48. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2012.01.005
- Rottach, E., 2013. Approach for Promoting and Measuring Gender Equity in the Scale-Up of Family Planning and Maternal, Neonatal, and Child Health Programs. Futures Group, Health Policy Project, Washington, DC. USA.
- Rüde, E., Wrede, J., Gundelach, M.L., 1976. Production of IgG antibodies and enhanced response of nude mice to DNP-AE-dextran. *J. Immunol.* 116, 527–533.
- Sajise, P., Royo, A.G., 2008. Moving Ahead with CIFOR-ICRAF Co-Programming and Collaboration in Southeast Asia and China.
- SC Secretariat, 2006. CGIAR Science Council - Criteria for Assessing Proposals for new Systemwide Programs.
- Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, 2007. Lessons Learnt from Selection and Implementation of the CGIAR Challenge Programs.
- Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, 2009. Instructions for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers.
- Science Council of the CGIAR, 2007. Report of the Second External Program and Management Review of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).
- Science Council of the CGIAR, 2008. The Role of Systemwide Initiatives in Implementing the CGIAR's Research Agenda - An Assessment of Current Systemwide and Ecoregional Programs (SWEPS).
- Science Council of the CGIAR, 2009. Experiences from Five Years of Performance

- Measurement System: Research-related indicators Lessons drawn by the Science Council, Final Draft, 25 September 2009.
- Sehring, J., Korhonen-Kurki, K., Brockhaus, M., 2013. Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): An application to compare national REDD+ policy processes. Working Paper 121.
- Sennhenn, A., Prinz, K., Gebauer, J., Whitbread, A., Jamnadass, R., Kehlenbeck, K., 2013. Identification of mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) landraces from Eastern and Central Kenya using a morphological and molecular approach. *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution* 61, 7–22. doi:10.1007/s10722-013-0012-2
- Seymour, F., 2011. CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry: Fund Council Meeting April 5, 2011 - Montpellier - PPT.
- Stadlmayr, B., Charrondière, U.R., Eisenwagen, S., Jamnadass, R., Kehlenbeck, K., 2013. Nutrient composition of selected indigenous fruits from sub-Saharan Africa: Nutrient composition of selected indigenous fruits from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 93, 2627–2636. doi:10.1002/jsfa.6196
- Sunderlin, W.D., Larson, A.M., Duchelle, A.E., Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Huynh, T.B., Awono, A., Dokken, T., 2013. How are REDD+ Proponents Addressing Tenure Problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.013
- Swiss Institute for Terrestrial Ecosystems, Department of Environmental Systems Science, n.d. Adaptive Ecosystem Service Scenarios in Oil Palm Landscapes.
- Tannock, G.A., Griffith, I.P., 1975. Degradation of myxovirus virion RNA by periodate. *Intervirology* 5, 150–161.
- Tanui, J., 2013. Strengthening Grassroots Institutions in Smallholder Farming Systems: An Emerging Model - Project Overview, Stakeholders' workshop.
- Tayşir, E.A., Pazarçık, Y., 2013. Business Ethics, Social Responsibility and Corporate Governance: Does the Strategic Management Field Really Care about these Concepts? *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, The Proceedings of 9th International Strategic Management Conference* 99, 294–303. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.497
- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2004a. *Sustaining Forests - A Development Strategy*.
- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2004b. *Sustaining Forests - A Development Strategy, Appendixes*.
- UNEP, 2011. *Forests in a Green Economy - A Synthesis*.
- United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development - Rio+20, 2012. *The Future we want*.
- van Noordwijk, M. et al., 2001. Negotiation support models for integrated natural resource management in tropical forest margins. *Conservation Ecology* 5(2) 21.
- Villamor, G.B., van Noordwijk, M., Djanibekov, U., Chiong-Javier, M.E., Catacutan, D., 2014.

Gender differences in land-use decisions: shaping multifunctional landscapes?
Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 6, 128–133.
doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.11.015

- World Agroforestry Centre, 2008a. 46th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2008b. 47th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2008c. 48th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2008d. World Agroforestry Centre - Audited Financial Statements 2008.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2009a. 49th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2009b. 50th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2009c. Medium Term Plan 2010-2012 - Transforming Lives and Landscapes through Agroforestry Science.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010a. 51st World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010b. 52nd World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010c. Agroforestry Food Security Programme (AFSP) - Baseline Survey Report.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010d. Annual Report 2009 - Agroforestry and Landscapes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010e. Enabling rural transformation and grassroots institutional building for sustainable land management and increased incomes and food security.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010f. ToR - Position Description - Anja Gassner.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2010g. World Agroforestry Centre - Financial Statement and Auditors' Report 2009.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011a. 53rd World Agroforestry Centre Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011b. 54th World Agroforestry Centre Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011c. Agroforestry and markets - Annual Report 2010 - West and Central Africa.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011d. Audited Financial Statements 2010.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011e. Human Resources Policies and Procedure Manual - Policy Guidelines Series 4.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2011f. World Agroforestry Centre - Audited Financial Statements 2010.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2012a. 55th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2012b. 56th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2012c. Annual Report 2011-2012 - Trees, Livelihoods, Landscapes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2012d. Audited financial statements 2011.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2012e. World Agroforestry Centre - Audited Financial

Statements 2011.

- World Agroforestry Centre, 2013a. 57th World Agroforestry Centre BoT Meeting Minutes.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2013b. A Regional Programme in the Sahel and Horn of Africa Enhancing Food and Water Security for Rural Economic Development.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2013c. Assessing Capacity Needs and Strategy Development for Grassroots Rural Institutions: A guide for Facilitators.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2013d. Capacity Development Strategy 2013-2018.
- World Agroforestry Centre, 2013e. World Agroforestry Centre - Audited Financial Statements 2012.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Paul Stapleton.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Dalia Catacutan.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Fergus Sinclair.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Frank Place.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Henry Neufeldt.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Meine van Noordwijk.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Muhammad Mehmood UI Hassan.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Ramni Jamnadass.
- World Agroforestry Centre, n.d. ToR - Position Description - Ravi Prabhu.
- World Agroforestry Centre, Hailu, M., Shah, W.P., 2008. Transforming lives and landscapes: strategy 2008-2015. World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi, Kenya.
- World Bank - Operations Evaluation Department 2001., 2001. Global Public Policies and Programs: Implications for Financing and Evaluation Proceedings from a World Bank Workshop.
- Wunder, S., 2005. CIFOR Occasional Paper No. 42: Payments for environmental services: Some nuts and bolts.

Annex B. Persons Consulted

Overall, 137 interviews with 206 people have been conducted who are listed below in alphabetical order. Some people have been interviewed several times.

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Abeysekera, Laksiri	Director of Finance and Operations	ICRAF	02 December 2013
Aboum nee Niondi, Isabelle Esther	Inspecteur des Impots, Programme de Securisation des Recettes Forestieres (PSFR)	Ministry of Finance	09 December 2013
Adil, Zulfikar	Director	Brik Quality Services	17 October 2013
Agnes, Ehanis		Farmer in Nkenlikok, Cameroon	10 December 10, 2013
Agueci, Vittorio	Program Budget Officer of Forestry Program	Bioersity International	07 February 2014
Akiegnawati, Ratna	Head, Field Manager	ICRAF	18 October 2013
Andriani, Rubeta	Research Officer	CIFOR	30 September 2013
Angelsen, Arild	Professor of Economics and Business at UMB, Senior Associate at CIFOR	CIFOR	11 November 2013
Araoche, Ambros	Steering Committee member, retired civil servant, former Forest Commissioner, now leading an NGO	Uganda Forest Authority	05 December 2013
Arinaitwe, Euzobio		University of Makerere	05 December 2013
Assemble, Samuel	Post-doctoral Research Fellow	CIFOR Cameroon	30 September 2013
Atanga, Felicitas	Assistant Representative	FAO	13 December 2013
Atangana, Louis Marie		Comité Villageoise de Concentration (CVC)	10 December 2013
Awono, Abdon	Senior Research Officer	CIFOR	13 December 2013
Balinga, Michael	FTA Coordinator of West Africa Sentinel Landscape/ Coordinator of Component 1.3 of BIODEV Project, CATIE Regional Scientist	CIFOR	08 October 2013 08 October 2013 11 October 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Banana, Abwoli	Professor	University of Makerere	05 December 2013 05 December 2013
Beer, John	Representative at the FTA Steering Committee	CATIE	16 January 2014
Belcher, Brian	FTA MEIA Team, CIFOR Senior Associate Scientist	CIFOR	09 October 2013
Billand, Alain	Research Unit Director	CIRAD	08 October 2013
Bird, Leslie	Director of Finance and Corporate Services	Bioversity International	06 February 2014
Blaser, Jürgen	Professor, Domain International Forestry	Bern University of Applied Science	28 November 2013
Bodo, Minsoim'A	Ancient J.L. Director of the Centre de Promotion du Bois de Yaoundé	Ministry of Forestry	09 December 2013
Borgel, Alain	Coordinator East Africa	IRD	06 December 2013
Brockhaus, Maria	FTA 4.1 Module leader, Module 1 GCS, CIFOR Senior Scientist	CIFOR	14 October 2013
Budisetiawan, Iman		Muara Bungo, Sumatra	18 October 2013
Catacutan, Delia	FTA Gender Focal Point, ICRAF Vietnam Country Representative	ICRAF	16 October 2013
Cerutti, Paolo	Senior Scientist	CIFOR	30 September 2013 01 October 2013 02 December 2013
Chapman, Robert	Head, Research Planning and Monitoring	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Chendauka, Bwalya	Principal Extension Officer	Forest Department	18 December 2013
Chia, Eugene	Governance and Institutional Issues	COBAM	07/08 October 2013
Collins, Wanda	Chair of the CIAT BOT	CIAT and other advisory assignments	07 November 2013
Cronkleton, Peter	FTA Component 1 CIFOR focal point, FTA Principal Scientist, Livelihoods	CIFOR	08 October 2013
de Luise, Allison	Resource Mobilization Unit	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Degrande, Ann	Researcher, Rural Advisory Services in West and Central Africa	ICRAF	07 December 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Derero, Abayneh		Forestry Research Center	12 December 2013
Dermawan, Ahmad	Scientist	CIFOR	01 October 2013
Dewi, Sonya	Landscape Ecologist	ICRAF	04 October 2013
Djoudi, Houria	Scientist	CIFOR	08 October 2013
Dupanloup, Jacques	Director General	Groupement de la Filiere Bois du Cameroun (GFBC)	10 December 2013
Echeverría, Ruben G.	Director General	CIAT	26 November 2013
Elias, Marlenene	FTA Gender Focal Point, Bioversity Gender Specialist/ Conservation and Management of Forest Genetic Resources	Bioversity International	22 October 2013
El-Lakany, Hosny	BOT Chair	CIFOR	12 November 2013
Eten Bokagne, Etienne	Vice President	ANCOVA	13 December 2013
Euzobio Arinaitwe		University of Makerere	05 December 2013
Finocchio, Francesco	Director of Human Resources	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Fobissie, Kalame	Congo Basin Regional Forest and Climate Change Coordinator	WWF	10 December 2013
Frison, Emile	former Director General	Bioversity International	14 January 2014
Frosio, Carl	Attaché charge de programmes Section Development Rural, Environment at Societe Civile	EU Cameroon	10 December 2013
Gassner, Anja	FTA Sentinel Landscapes Coordinator, ICRAF Co-leader, Research Methods Group	ICRAF	03 December 2013 06 December 2013
Gaveuay, David		CIFOR	02 October 2013
Gezahqne, Alemu	Senior Researcher	CIFOR, Forestry Research Center	12 December 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Gnych, Sophia	Consultant	CIFOR	02 October 2013
Gonzales, Violeta	Fundraising & Donor Relations Manager	CIFOR	04 October 2013
Gotor, Elisabetta	FTA MEIA Team, Bioversity Impact Assessment Specialist	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Guariguata, Manuel	FTA Component 2 CIFOR Focal Point, CIFOR Principal Scientist	CIFOR	01 October 2013 10 October 2013
Gumbo, Davison	Scientist	CIFOR Zambia	16 December 2013
Gunarso, Petrus	Director	Tropenbos	16 October 2013
Hadgu, Kiros	Country representative for Ethiopia	ICRAF	12 December 2013
Hagelberg, Niklas	Programme Officer	UNEP HQs	05 December 2013
Handoyo, Dri	Head, Forest Protection	District Forestry Office. Planning Office of Merangin, District, Department of Implementation	16 October 2013
Hanna, Rashid	Representing Resident	IITA Cameroon	14 October 2013
Hassan, Mehmood	Head of Capacity Development	ICRAF	02 December 2013
Hergoualc'h, Kristell	Scientist	CIFOR, REDD Alert	19 October 2013 19 October 2013
Herold, Martin	Professor for Geographic Information Science	University of Wageningen	08 October 2013
Holmgren, Peter	Director General	CIFOR	03 October 2013
Hudson, John	CIFOR BOT Vice Chair and Chair of the Programme Committee, Ex officio ICRAF BOT member	CIFOR, ICRAF and other advisory assignments	05 November 2013
Ichowita, Amy	Scientist working with Bioversity project	CIFOR	12 December 2013
Ingram, Verina	Senior Associate	CIFOR	11 October 2013
Irawan, Deddy		Muara Bungo, Sumatra	18 October 2013
Jamnadas, Ramni	FTA Sub-component leader within 6.1, ICRAF Leader, project domain 3	ICRAF	04 December 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Jasnari	Field staff, Jambi	ICRAF	18 October 2013
Jepang Sandjong, Camille	Programme Officer for Central & West Africa/Regional Water and Wetlands Programme	IUCN	09 December 2013
Jonathan, Emmanuel Pierre	National Coordinator Smallholder Oil Palm Development Programme	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	11 December 2013
Joscelyne, Graham	BOT member and Audit & Risk Committee Chair	CIAT	12 November 2013
Kamaruddin		Tana Toa Village, Bulukumba district	13 October 2013
Kanowski, Peter	Deputy Director General	CIFOR	07 October 2013 03-07 October 2013
Kassa, Habtemanian	Scientist, Forests and Livelihoods	CIFOR Ethiopia Office	12 December 2013
Keem Khoo, Lay	Senior HR Specialist	CIFOR	02 February 2013
Kehlenbeck, Katia	Associate Scientist	ICRAF	04 December 2013
Kelbe, Daniel	Directeur	Cooperative le Planteur, SOCAPALM	11 December 2013
Kindt, Roeland	FTA component 2 ICRAF focal point, ICRAF Senior Ecologist, Science Domain 3	ICRAF	04 December 2013
Kioko, James		World Vision	06 December 2013
Komarudin, Heru	Researcher	CIFOR	02 October 2013
Kroma, Margaret M.	Assistant Director General; Partnerships, Capacity Development, Impact and Extension	ICRAF	04 December 2013
Kusworo, Ahmad	Adviser	Fauna & Flora International-Indonesia Programme	10 October 2013
Lescuyer, Guillaume	Scientist	CIRAD	01 October 2013 13 December 2013
Levang, Patrice	Seconded Scientist	IRD/CIFOR	02 October 2013 11 December 2013
Liswanto, Darmawan	Indonesia Country Programme Director	Fauna & Flora International	10 October 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Lubuk Beringin Village Leader and others			17 October 2013
Luzon, Josephine	Head of Finance	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Lynam, John	Chair of the ICRAF BOT	ICRAF and other advisory assignments	08 November 2013
Mahonghol, Denis		Traffic	09 December 2013
Makumba, Ignatius	Acting Director of Forestry	Forest Department	18 December 2013
Martini, Endri	Extension Specialist	ICRAF	12 October 2013
Mbitikon, Raimond	Executive Secretary	COMIFAC	10 December 2013
Mbow, Cheikh	Senior Scientist	ICRAF	03 December 2013
Mejia, Elene	Researcher	CIFOR	01 October 2013
Minang, Peter	Senior Scientist	ICRAF	04 December 2013
Mishbah, Ibu	Head	District Forest Service of the Bulukumba district	13 October 2013
Moombe, Kaala	Researcher	CIFOR Zambia	16 December 2013
Moore, Liza	Director of Human Resources	CIFOR	02 February 2013
Mowo, Jeremias	Member of Steering Committee for the FTA Evergreen Agriculture Project, ICRAF Regional coordinator	ICRAF	02 December 2013
Mpagire, Steven	Senior Forest Officer, Forest Sector Support Department	Uganda Forest Authority	05 December 2013
Mukasa, Concepta		AUPWAE	05 December 2013 05 December 2013
Mukonen, Paulus	Associate Expert, Special Ecologist, GIS and mapping, Finnish government	Bioversity International	10 December 2013
Musonda, Winnie	Assistant Resident Representative and Environment Adviser	UNDP Zambia	17 December 2013
Muthuri, Catherine	FTA Project leader, Scientist coordinating the Evergreen agriculture project, ICRAF Research Scientist	ICRAF	02 December 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Mutua, Joseph	Technical Manager	Kenya Network of Dissemination of Agricultural Technology (KENDAT)	06 December 2013
Mwangi, Esther	FTA Gender Coordinator, CIFOR Senior Scientist, Forests and Governance Programme	CIFOR	08 October 2013
Nana		District Forestry Office. Planning Office of Merangin, District, Department of Implementation	16 October 2013
Nasi, Robert	FTA Director, CIFOR Principal Scientist	CIFOR	06 October 2013 10 October 2013
Nchanji, Yvonne Kiki	Gender in „Beyond timber“	Bioversity	13 December 2013
Neufeldt, Henry	FTA Component 4 ICRAF focal point, ICRAF Leader of the Climate Change Science Domain	ICRAF	19 November 2013 06 December 2013
Ngandjui, Germain		Traffic	09 December 2013
Ngongo, Ebia	Consultant, former DG of forestry of MINFO	BUREDIP	13 December 2013
Noor, Faisal	Consultant	CIFOR/IRMAC	02 October 2013
Obidzinski, Krystof	Senior Scientist	CIFOR	01 October 2013 02 October 2013 04 October 2013
Ofori, Daniel	Tree domestication Scientist	ICRAF	04 December 2013
Ojanen, Marja	Councillor, Environment and Natural Resources	Embassy of Finland	17 December 17, 2013
Okiror, Grace	Executive Director	AUPWAE	05 December 2013
Pacheco, Pablo	FTA Component 5 Coordinator, CIFOR Principal Scientist	CIFOR	01 October 2013 02 October 2013 11 October 2013
Perez, Alba	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	COBAM	07-08 October 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Piketty, Marie-Gabrielle	Department Environment and Society	CIRAD	03 October 2013
Pinedo, Miguel	Scientist	CIFOR	10 October 2013
Place, Frank	FTA MEIA team, ICRAF Head of Impact Assessment	ICRAF	02 December 2013 03 December 2013
Potter, Lesley	Visiting Fellow ANU, Consultant to CIFOR	CIFOR	02 October 2013
Poulos, Alison	CGIAR Research Program Process Manager	Bioversity International	07 February 2014
Pradhan, Ujjwal	FTA Component 5 ICRAF Focal Point, ICRAF SEA Regional Coordinator	ICRAF	04 October 2013
Pradhu, Ravi	Deputy Director General, Research	ICRAF	02 December 2013
Purnamo, Boen	Senior Advisor to the Minister of Forestry,	former Secretary General Ministry of Forestry	16 October 2013
Purnomo, Herry	Scientist	CIFOR	04-10 October 2013
Purwanto, Edi	Director	Operation Wallacea Trust (OWT), AgFor Partner	10 October 2013
Putra, Agung	Field staff	ICRAF	18 October 18, 2013
Putzel, Louis	Senior Scientist	CIFOR	30 September 30, 2013
Rijsberman, Frank	CEO	CGIAR Consortium	18 November 2013
Roda, Jean Marc	Research Fellow	CIRAD	03 October 2013
Romero, Claudia	Courtesy Assistant Professor of Biology	University of Florida	10 October 2013
Roshetko, James	Leader, Trees and Market Unit SE Asia	ICRAF	12 October 2013 13 October 2013
Rudebjer, Per	Head a.i. Knowledge Management and Capacity Strengthening Unit	Bioversity International	08 February 2014
Russell, Aaron	Scientist	CIFOR	13 November 2013
Samaturu womens group, Bulukumba district	FTA AgFor, Agroforestry and Forestry in Sulawesi		13 October 2013
Santoso, Iman	Director General, Forest Research and Development Agency (FORDA) and Host Country Representative to CIFOR BOT	FORDA, CIFOR	07 October 2013 16 October 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Savilaasko, Sini	Finnish Associate Expert	CIFOR	10 October 2013 10 October 2013
Schoneveld, George	Scientist	CIFOR	11 October 2013
Seymore, Frances	former Director General	CIFOR	01 December 2013 02 December 2013
Sido, Tesfaye	Research Assistant	CIMMYT	12 December 2013
Sinclair, Fergus	FTA Component 1 Coordinator, ICRAF Leader of Science Domain, Agroforestry Systems	ICRAF	01 December 2013 02 December 2013 02 December 2013
Snook, Laura	FTA Component 2 Coordinator, Bioversity Programme Leader, Forest Genetic Resources Conservation	Bioversity International	06 February 2014
Solórzano, Luis	Director of Staff	CGIAR Consortium Leadership Team	10 October 2013
Somarriba, Eduardo		CATIE	13 January 2014
Sonne, Norbert	Coordinator of the Forest Program and GFTN, Manager WWF Cameroon	WWF	10 December 2013
Sonwa, Dennis	FTA Coordinator of Cameroon Sentinel Landscape site, CIFOR Senior Scientist	CIFOR	09 October 2013 13 December 2013
Sugardiman, Ruandha A.	Deputy Director of Spatial Data Network, Directorate General of Forestry Planning Ministry of Forestry	Spatial Data Network, Forestry Planning Ministry of Forestry	10 December 2013
Sunderland, Terry	FTA Component 3 CIFOR Focal Point, CIFOR Principal Scientist	CIFOR	10 October 2013 10 October 2013 10 October 201
Sunderlin, William	Principal Scientist	CIFOR	11 October 2013
Tata, Hesti Lestari	Ecologist	FORDA/ICRAF	18 October 2013

Interviewee	Position	Home Institution	Date of Interview
Tchoundjeu, Zac	Regional Director for West and Central Africa	ICRAF	07 December 2013
Terheggen, Anne	Senior Scientist	ICRAF	30 September 2013 04 October 2013
Tiani, Anne-Marie	Senior scientist	CIFOR and coordinator of COBAM	07 October 2013 08 October 2013
Tibazalika, Alice	Assistant of Concepts	AUPWAE	05 December 2013 05 December 2013
Tutwiler, Ann	Recently appointed Director General	Bioversity International	13 December 2013
Tumuluru, Kumar	Director Finance and Administrations	CIFOR	02 October 2013
Vagen, Tor	Senior scientist	ICRAF	03 December 2013
Verchot, Lou	Director for Forest and Environment	CIFOR	14 November 2013
Wahyuni, Sri		Tana Toa Village, Bulukumba district	13 October 2013
Wardell, Andrew	Research Director Governance	CIFOR	01 October 2013 02 October 2013
Weng, Lingfei	PhD intern	CIFOR	30 September 2013
Weng, Xiaoxue	Researcher	IIED	30 September 2013
Widayati, Atiek	Leader, Spatial Analysis Unit	ICRAF	13 October 2013
Stephan Weise	DDG Research	Bioversity International	06 February 2014
Wild, Hilary	Chair of the ICRAF BOT Audit and Finance Committee	ICRAF and other advisory assignments	08 November 2013
Yuliani, Linda	FTA Coordinator of AgFor in Bogor and Coordinator of Field Station of AgFor ,CIFOR Researcher	CIFOR	10 October 2013
Yuliani, Linda	Researcher	CIFOR	13 October 2013 13 October 2013
Zainal Abidin, Syayhaneem Mohamad	Professor	UPM, Malaysia	03 October 2013
Zuckerman, Paul	BOT Chair	Bioversity	29 November 2013

Annex C: Short Bios of Evaluation Team Members

Markus Palenberg (Team Leader). Markus is the managing director of the *Institute for Development Strategy*, an independent research institute in Munich, Germany, and works as researcher, evaluator and consultant. His research focuses on evaluation methodology such as tools for efficiency analysis and causal chains in complex interventions. As evaluator, he conducts theory-based evaluations of complex interventions, with a special focus on Global and Regional Partnership Programs (GRPPs). Markus also consults programs and networks on impact strategies, corporate governance arrangements and M&E systems. Over the last ten years, Markus has conducted more than thirty research and consulting assignments in the public and private sector, including eight global program evaluations of which three were CGIAR Challenge Programs. Currently, Markus is team leader of the global program review “The World Bank Group’s Partnership with the Global Environment Facility”, commissioned by the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group and covering 22 years of collaboration between the Global Environment Facility, the World Bank, and the International Finance Corporation. Markus serves as Executive Board Member of the CGIAR Generation Challenge Programme and is Program Management Team Member of the CGIAR program HarvestPlus. He is member of the GRPP Technical Advisory Panel of the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, member of the Scientific Committee of the 2015 IWRA World Water Congress, and fellow of the Global Public Policy Institute. Before entering the development field, Markus worked as corporate manager, as strategy consultant with McKinsey&Company, Inc., and as postdoctoral researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Markus holds a Doctorate in Theoretical Physics.

Marko Katila (Team Member). Marko is a Senior Evaluator, Forest Policy, Economics and Trade). He works as a Senior Adviser at Indufor, an international forestry consulting company, and also at Dasos Capital, a leading European private equity funds specialized in investing in sustainable forestry. Marko is a member in the Finnish Society of Forestry Research (since 1988) and a Finnish Forest Economists Association. Marko has worked 27 years in international forestry and development in different positions: senior consultant and vice president in an international forestry consulting company, senior economic advisor at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, and a Research Director and Partner in an international timberland investment fund. During his career he has carried out several assignments for clients such as the World Bank, FAO, UNFF, and EC and covered more than 30 countries in Asia, Africa and Europe and lived extensively in South East Asia and South Asia. Before joining the consulting world Marko was a full time faculty member (Research Associate) in the Department of Social Economics of Forestry at the University of Helsinki. After leaving the university, Marko has kept close links with the research community through reviewing doctoral dissertations and Master’s theses, scientific articles and serving from time to time as a visiting lecturer in international forestry. Marko is an experienced forest economist specialized in international forest policy and sector planning, forestry investment and trade and all aspects of project cycle management from project identification and design to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. His most recent

major valuation experience dealt with the evaluation of FAO's global forestry work. Currently, Marko is contributing to the evaluation the Climate Change Investment Funds, being responsible for the Forest Investment Program (FIP) evaluation. Marko holds PhD degrees and Master's degrees in forest economics in USA (Fulbright Scholar) and Finland, respectively.

Florencia Montagnini (Team Member). Florencia is a Senior Research Scientist at Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and she is also Director of the Program in Tropical Forestry of the Yale Global Institute for Sustainable Forestry. She holds honorary professorships at several universities in Latin America and is a Senior Fellow of the Energy and Climate Partners of the Americas, Climate Change program, US State Department. She also works as a private consultant in Agroforestry and Restoration, advising on projects and programs of her specialty. Before Yale, she was the Head of the Area of Forests and Biodiversity at the Tropical Agriculture Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE). Florencia's research focuses on variables controlling the sustainability of managed ecosystems in the tropics, such as forest, tree plantations and agroforestry systems, with a special emphasis on Latin America; sustainable land use systems that integrate ecological principles with economic, social, and political factors; the principles and applications of forest landscape restoration; the reforestation of degraded lands with native species; mixed-species plantations; tropical plantation silviculture; identification and quantification of ecological services provided by forest ecosystems, including biodiversity, carbon sequestration and watershed protection; organic farming using indigenous resources; Payments for Environmental Services as tools to promote restoration, conservation, and rural development. Florencia is currently conducting projects in regions encompassing major types of tropical and subtropical humid and dry forest in South and Central America. Projects include examining the role of native tree species in plantations and agroforestry systems in reclaiming degraded areas with species of economic value; the identification and quantification of ecological services provided by forests (biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration, and water); and organic farming in agroforestry systems with native species. In her research, she collaborates with institutions such as CATIE, as well as with universities and other academic, private and government institutions in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Panama. Florencia has written eight books on agroforestry systems and ecological restoration, including a major textbook in tropical forest ecology and management, and about 200 scientific articles, of which 80 percent have been published in international refereed journals. Florencia holds a B.S. in Agronomy from the National University of Rosario, Argentina; an M.S. in Ecology from the Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Research; and a Ph.D. in Ecology from the University of Georgia, USA.

Carmenza Robledo (Team Member). Carmenza has over 15 years of experience on Forest and Climate Change issues, with special regard of developmental aspects, including socio-economic and institutional issues as well as with the attribution of environmental impacts. She has project experience in Latin America, Africa and Asia, as well as experience advising international organizations including FAO, World Bank, ITTO, UNDP, UNEP, CIFOR, GEF,

UNFCCC Secretariat or IUCN. She combines scientific research, international advisory and project oriented assignments. Carmenza, Colombian and Swiss nationality, studied architecture at the Javeriana University of Bogotá and did an interdisciplinary master degree in regional development. Further she pursued a master in economics in Braunschweig (Germany) and holds a doctoral degree in geography of the University of Stuttgart, Germany. From 1998 to 2003 she worked as a Senior Scientist in the Swiss Federal Institute for Material Testing and Research (EMPA) on climate change and forest. In 2003 Carmenza joined the Swiss Foundation for Development and international Cooperation – Intercooperation - as Climate Change Task Manager and from 2006 as Coordinator of the Climate Change Group, an international network of climate experts within the organization. Carmenza led the Environment and Climate Change Team from 2009 until 2012. In 2012, Carmenza established her independent consulting firm ECOEXISTENCE and shares her professional time between consultancy in her company and research as Associated Senior Researcher in the Institute for Environmental Decisions (IED) of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich (ETH – Zürich) ETH. Currently she is a Lead Author for the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Federica Coccia (Team Member). Federica works as an Evaluation Analyst in the Independent Evaluation Arrangement of the CGIAR. Prior to joining the CGIAR, she worked with the Food and Agriculture Organization for 12 years. Federica collaborated with the Evaluation Service of FAO on various evaluations including the country evaluation for the Democratic Republic of Congo and the evaluation of FAO's operational capacity in emergencies. In 2006, she supported the core team of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO, particularly on the Administration, Management and Organization component of the evaluation. Following the IEE, Federica worked for the FAO Conference where she was closely involved in the reform process that the Organization embarked upon following the IEE. In 2010, Federica joined the Business Improvement Unit of FAO, tasked with streamlining and making more efficient the administration processes of the Organization. Federica has an MA in development economics from Manchester University (UK) and has completed the Melcrum International Communication Black Belt Program. Federica has solid experience in gender issues and rural development, as well as management and governance of large organizations.

Andrea Deisenrieder (Analyst). Andrea has been working as Research Associate for the Institute for Development Strategy and has been contributing to different multilateral consulting and evaluation projects. Before joining the FTA evaluation team, Andrea provided her support to an Indian Think Tank in New Delhi for conducting an analysis on corporate governance and business responsibility standards in large Indian companies and wrote a paper on fiscal incentives for enhancing renewable energies in India. Prior her assignment in India, Andrea assisted the IfDS team in developing a new Affiliates strategy for the Global Development Learning Network (GDLN), a global partnership initiative for South-South cooperation established by the World Bank. She was also involved in the early stage of evaluating the global partnership between the World Bank Group and the Global Environment Facility as part of the Global Program Review conducted by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank. Earlier, Andrea supported to the governance analysis of the Cereal System Initiative in South Asia (CSISA) commissioned by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and USAID. Before joining IfDS, Andrea assisted the Country Director of the GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) in Beijing in promoting and coordinating sustainable development projects in China and supported the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs in New York in conducting capacity development projects in a series of developing countries. Andrea holds a Masters in Sociology, Psychology and Communication Science and wrote her thesis on the United Nations human rights practice with a focus on the MDGs and humanitarian interventions.

Annex D. Project Matching and Characterization Analysis

One evaluation work package consisted in a “project matching and characterization” analysis that was applied to a large and relevant share of FTA’s project portfolio.

The main purposes of this analysis are threefold:

- to assess the degree to which FTA proposals match with the objectives of the FTA program components they are assigned to, and with the objectives of the CGIAR’s Strategic Results Framework;
- to systematically characterize a representative share of FTA project proposals along a set of pre-defined criteria; and
- to at least superficially acquaint evaluation team members with a sufficiently large share of the FTA project portfolio to mitigate undue generalization errors.

From the entire FTA portfolio, 100 projects were selected according to the following criteria:

- availability of the project proposal and/or the grant agreement;
- coverage of the large grants with priority;
- adequate coverage of all FTA components.

Analysis procedure

The available documentation on these projects was subsequently reviewed by two Evaluation Team members that filled in a comprehensive multiple choice questionnaire for each project, covering the following aspects as described in the process guidance for this exercise.

1. Step 1:
 - a. assess matching between project objectives/descriptions and FTA proposal theme objectives (also called “components”)
 - b. Answer categories:
 - i. SCORE 4: The project’s objectives and approaches lie entirely within the objectives and theories of change of the theme assigned to it.
 - ii. SCORE 3: All principal project objectives and approaches lie within the objectives and theories of change of the theme assigned to it (but some less important objectives lie outside).
 - iii. SCORE 2: One or more – but not most or all – principal project objectives and approaches lie outside the objective(s) and theories of change of the theme assigned to it.

- iv. SCORE 1: Most or all principal project objectives and approaches lie outside the objective(s) and theories of change of the theme assigned to it.
 - v. No assessment provided. In this case please insert a comment explaining why.
2. Step 2: Choose to which SRF goal the project contributes to (taken from the proposal:
 - a. All of them
 - b. 1 and 2
 - c. 1 and 3
 - d. 2 and 3
 - e. None of them
3. Step 3: re-assign projects to themes, i.e. make your own “best fit” matching of projects to themes, including assigning to multiple themes.
4. Step 4: Assessment of cross-cutting topics.
 - a. Gender: assess how gender is covered in project proposal by choosing amongst the following categories: a) explicit strategy or approach described, b) described in general terms/principles, c) gender is not really mentioned d) project is not gender relevant.
 - b. Sentinel Landscapes (SL): a) project is about setting up an SL, b) project resides and makes use of an SL, c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one, d) SL not mentioned
 - c. Capacity development: a) project is mostly about capacity development (is main project objective), b) capacity development is a rather independent project component (project would also function without), c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives (other than CD), d) capacity development not really mentioned.
 - d. Partnerships: a) project is explicit about partnerships, b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit, c) partnerships are not really mentioned.
 - e. Theory of change (1/2): a) project describes theory of change/impact pathway explicitly (graph or narrative) mentions boundary partners and explains how impact is achieved in the end, b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached, c) project does not really say how impact is achieved.
 - f. Theory of change (2/2): a) project aims primarily at influencing international or regional policy, b) national policy, c) project aims primarily at adoption of

- approaches and techniques, c) adoption of tangible products (e.g. germplasm), a) and b), a) and c), b) and c).
- g. Impact assessment: a) a baseline study is foreseen, b) an evaluation is foreseen.
 - h. Has the project identified a) output-level indicators that measure success b) outcome-level indicators that measure success and/or c) is a baseline study is part of the project? (options not exclusive).

Aggregate Analysis Results

<p>Reassign components:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">from ...</th> <th colspan="5"></th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th>to ...</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>9</td> <td>8</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>23</td> <td>17</td> <td>17</td> <td>30</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>17%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>10%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>27% of projects not correctly assigned in opinion of eval. team</p>	from ...								to ...	1	2	3	4	5			1		7	2	1	0		10	2	1		1	2	0		4	3	3	2		1	1		7	4	0	0	5		0		5	5	0	0	0	0			0		4	9	8	4	1		26		23	17	17	30	10				17%	53%	47%	13%	10%			<p>Which SRF goal^a does the project contribute to?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>100</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>2</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>40</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 and 2</td> <td>20</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 and 3</td> <td>5</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 and 3</td> <td>12</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All of them</td> <td>8</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		100	100%	None	2	2%	1	9	9%	2	40	40%	3	4	4%	1 and 2	20	20%	1 and 3	5	5%	2 and 3	12	12%	All of them	8	8%
from ...																																																																																																												
to ...	1	2	3	4	5																																																																																																							
1		7	2	1	0		10																																																																																																					
2	1		1	2	0		4																																																																																																					
3	3	2		1	1		7																																																																																																					
4	0	0	5		0		5																																																																																																					
5	0	0	0	0			0																																																																																																					
	4	9	8	4	1		26																																																																																																					
	23	17	17	30	10																																																																																																							
	17%	53%	47%	13%	10%																																																																																																							
	100	100%																																																																																																										
None	2	2%																																																																																																										
1	9	9%																																																																																																										
2	40	40%																																																																																																										
3	4	4%																																																																																																										
1 and 2	20	20%																																																																																																										
1 and 3	5	5%																																																																																																										
2 and 3	12	12%																																																																																																										
All of them	8	8%																																																																																																										
<p>Gender</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>100</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>17</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>27</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>51</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>5</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		100	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	17	17%	b) described in general terms/principles	27	27%	c) gender is not really mentioned	51	51%	d) project is not gender relevant	5	5%	<p>Sentinel Landscapes</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>100</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is about setting up an SL</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project resides and makes use of an SL</td> <td>3</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one</td> <td>5</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) SL not mentioned</td> <td>92</td> <td>92%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		100	100%	a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%	b) project resides and makes use of an SL	3	3%	c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	5	5%	d) SL not mentioned	92	92%																																																																													
	100	100%																																																																																																										
a) explicit strategy or approach described	17	17%																																																																																																										
b) described in general terms/principles	27	27%																																																																																																										
c) gender is not really mentioned	51	51%																																																																																																										
d) project is not gender relevant	5	5%																																																																																																										
	100	100%																																																																																																										
a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%																																																																																																										
b) project resides and makes use of an SL	3	3%																																																																																																										
c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	5	5%																																																																																																										
d) SL not mentioned	92	92%																																																																																																										
<p>Capacity Development</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>100</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>5</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>37</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>37</td> <td>37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned</td> <td>21</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		100	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	5	5%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	37	37%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	37	37%	d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned	21	21%	<p>Partnerships</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>100</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is explicit about partnerships</td> <td>73</td> <td>73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit</td> <td>12</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) partnerships are not really mentioned</td> <td>15</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		100	100%	a) project is explicit about partnerships	73	73%	b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	12	12%	c) partnerships are not really mentioned	15	15%																																																																																
	100	100%																																																																																																										
a) project is mostly about capacity development	5	5%																																																																																																										
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	37	37%																																																																																																										
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	37	37%																																																																																																										
d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned	21	21%																																																																																																										
	100	100%																																																																																																										
a) project is explicit about partnerships	73	73%																																																																																																										
b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	12	12%																																																																																																										
c) partnerships are not really mentioned	15	15%																																																																																																										
<p>ToC 1</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>99</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td>26</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td>39</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how impact is achieved</td> <td>34</td> <td>34%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		99	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	26	26%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	39	39%	c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	34	34%	<p>ToC 2 - Project aims primarily at:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>98</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) influencing international or regional policy</td> <td>2</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) influencing national policy</td> <td>14</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) adoption of tangible products</td> <td>25</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) and b)</td> <td>10</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) and c)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) and c)</td> <td>31</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a), b) and c)</td> <td>16</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		98	100%	a) influencing international or regional policy	2	2%	b) influencing national policy	14	14%	c) adoption of tangible products	25	26%	a) and b)	10	10%	a) and c)	0	0%	b) and c)	31	32%	a), b) and c)	16	16%																																																																							
	99	100%																																																																																																										
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	26	26%																																																																																																										
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	39	39%																																																																																																										
c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	34	34%																																																																																																										
	98	100%																																																																																																										
a) influencing international or regional policy	2	2%																																																																																																										
b) influencing national policy	14	14%																																																																																																										
c) adoption of tangible products	25	26%																																																																																																										
a) and b)	10	10%																																																																																																										
a) and c)	0	0%																																																																																																										
b) and c)	31	32%																																																																																																										
a), b) and c)	16	16%																																																																																																										

Impact Assessment (IA)	97 100%		How adequate was the level of info on the project?			98 100%		
a) a baseline study is foreseen	3	3%	inadequate	1	21	21%		
b) an evaluation is foreseen	34	35%	about right	2	60	61%		
c) both	26	27%	very adequate	3	17	17%		
d) none	34	35%						

- a. SRF Goals: 1) create and accelerate sustainable increases in the productivity and production of healthy food by and for the poor; 2) conserve, enhance and sustainably use natural resources and biodiversity to improve the livelihoods of the poor in response to climate change and other factors; and 3) promote policy and institutional change that will stimulate agricultural growth and equity to benefit the poor, especially rural women and other disadvantaged groups.

Component Results: Reassign Components

Component 1			Component 2			Component 3			Component 4			Component 5		
4			9			8			4			1		
1 to 2	2	1	2 to 1	1	7	3 to 1	1	2	4 to 1	1	1	1 to 2	2	0
1 to 3	3	3	2 to 3	3	2	3 to 2	2	1	4 to 2	2	2	1 to 3	3	0
1 to 4	4	0	2 to 4	4	0	3 to 4	4	5	4 to 3	3	1	1 to 4	4	1
1 to 5	5	0	2 to 5	5	0	3 to 5	5	0	4 to 5	5	0	1 to 5	5	0

Component Results: Which SRF goal does the project contribute to?

Component 1			Component 2			Component 3			Component 4		
23 100%			17 100%			17 100%			30 100%		
None	0	0%	None	0	0%	None	1	6%	None	0	0%
1	5	22%	1	4	24%	1	0	0%	1	0	0%
2	6	26%	2	4	24%	2	6	35%	2	23	77%
3	0	0%	3	1	6%	3	0	0%	3	0	0%
1 and 2	3	13%	1 and 2	6	35%	1 and 2	6	35%	1 and 2	5	17%
1 and 3	1	4%	1 and 3	0	0%	1 and 3	2	12%	1 and 3	2	7%
2 and 3	2	9%	2 and 3	1	6%	2 and 3	1	6%	2 and 3	0	0%
All of them	6	26%	All of them	1	6%	All of them	1	6%	All of them	0	0%

Component 5		
	10	100%
None of them	1	10%
1	0	0%
2	0	0%
3	3	30%
1 and 2	0	0%
1 and 3	0	0%
2 and 3	6	60%
All of them	0	0%

Component Results: Gender

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>23</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>6</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>3</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>13</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>1</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 1				23	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	6	26%	b) described in general terms/principles	3	13%	c) gender is not really mentioned	13	57%	d) project is not gender relevant	1	4%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 2</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>17</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>2</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>12</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>3</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 2				17	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	0	0%	b) described in general terms/principles	2	12%	c) gender is not really mentioned	12	71%	d) project is not gender relevant	3	18%
Component 1																																					
	23	100%																																			
a) explicit strategy or approach described	6	26%																																			
b) described in general terms/principles	3	13%																																			
c) gender is not really mentioned	13	57%																																			
d) project is not gender relevant	1	4%																																			
Component 2																																					
	17	100%																																			
a) explicit strategy or approach described	0	0%																																			
b) described in general terms/principles	2	12%																																			
c) gender is not really mentioned	12	71%																																			
d) project is not gender relevant	3	18%																																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>17</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>3</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>7</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>7</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 3				17	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	3	18%	b) described in general terms/principles	7	41%	c) gender is not really mentioned	7	41%	d) project is not gender relevant	0	0%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 4</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>30</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>7</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>10</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>13</td> <td>43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 4				30	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	7	23%	b) described in general terms/principles	10	33%	c) gender is not really mentioned	13	43%	d) project is not gender relevant	0	0%
Component 3																																					
	17	100%																																			
a) explicit strategy or approach described	3	18%																																			
b) described in general terms/principles	7	41%																																			
c) gender is not really mentioned	7	41%																																			
d) project is not gender relevant	0	0%																																			
Component 4																																					
	30	100%																																			
a) explicit strategy or approach described	7	23%																																			
b) described in general terms/principles	10	33%																																			
c) gender is not really mentioned	13	43%																																			
d) project is not gender relevant	0	0%																																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 5</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>10</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) explicit strategy or approach described</td> <td>1</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) described in general terms/principles</td> <td>4</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) gender is not really mentioned</td> <td>4</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) project is not gender relevant</td> <td>1</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 5				10	100%	a) explicit strategy or approach described	1	10%	b) described in general terms/principles	4	40%	c) gender is not really mentioned	4	40%	d) project is not gender relevant	1	10%																			
Component 5																																					
	10	100%																																			
a) explicit strategy or approach described	1	10%																																			
b) described in general terms/principles	4	40%																																			
c) gender is not really mentioned	4	40%																																			
d) project is not gender relevant	1	10%																																			

Component Results: Sentinel Landscapes

Component 1 23 100%			Component 2 17 100%		
a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%	a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%
b) project resides and makes use of an SL	0	0%	b) project resides and makes use of an SL	1	6%
c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	2	9%	c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	0	0%
d) SL not mentioned	21	91%	d) SL not mentioned	16	94%
Component 3 17 100%			Component 4 30 100%		
a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%	a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%
b) project resides and makes use of an SL	0	0%	b) project resides and makes use of an SL	1	3%
c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	1	6%	c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	2	7%
d) SL not mentioned	16	94%	d) SL not mentioned	27	90%
Component 5 10 100%					
a) project is about setting up an SL	0	0%			
b) project resides and makes use of an SL	1	10%			
c) project mentions SL but is not really linked to one	0	0%			
d) SL not mentioned	9	90%			

Component Results: Capacity Development

<p>Component 1</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>23</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>1</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>16</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>4</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned</td> <td>2</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		23	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	1	4%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	16	70%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	4	17%	d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned	2	9%	<p>Component 2</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>17</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>2</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>8</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>3</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really mentioned</td> <td>4</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		17	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	2	12%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	8	47%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	3	18%	d) CD not really mentioned	4	24%
	23	100%																													
a) project is mostly about capacity development	1	4%																													
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	16	70%																													
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	4	17%																													
d) CD not really, or weakly, mentioned	2	9%																													
	17	100%																													
a) project is mostly about capacity development	2	12%																													
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	8	47%																													
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	3	18%																													
d) CD not really mentioned	4	24%																													
<p>Component 3</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>17</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>4</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>10</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really or weakly mentioned</td> <td>3</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		17	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	0	0%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	4	24%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	10	59%	d) CD not really or weakly mentioned	3	18%	<p>Component 4</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>30</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>1</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>4</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>18</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really mentioned</td> <td>7</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		30	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	1	3%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	4	13%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	18	60%	d) CD not really mentioned	7	23%
	17	100%																													
a) project is mostly about capacity development	0	0%																													
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	4	24%																													
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	10	59%																													
d) CD not really or weakly mentioned	3	18%																													
	30	100%																													
a) project is mostly about capacity development	1	3%																													
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	4	13%																													
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	18	60%																													
d) CD not really mentioned	7	23%																													
<p>Component 5</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>10</th> <th>100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project is mostly about capacity development</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) capacity development is a rather independent project component</td> <td>5</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives</td> <td>2</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) CD not really mentioned</td> <td>3</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		10	100%	a) project is mostly about capacity development	0	0%	b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	5	50%	c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	2	20%	d) CD not really mentioned	3	30%																
	10	100%																													
a) project is mostly about capacity development	0	0%																													
b) capacity development is a rather independent project component	5	50%																													
c) capacity development is critical for reaching project objectives	2	20%																													
d) CD not really mentioned	3	30%																													

Component Results: Partnerships

Component 1			Component 2		
23 100%			17 100%		
a) project is explicit about partnerships	19	83%	a) project is explicit about partnerships	7	41%
b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	1	4%	b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	4	24%
c) partnerships are not really mentioned	3	13%	c) partnerships are not really mentioned	6	35%
Component 3			Component 4		
17 100%			30 100%		
a) project is explicit about partnerships	15	88%	a) project is explicit about partnerships	21	70%
b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	1	6%	b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	6	20%
c) partnerships are not really mentioned	1	6%	c) partnerships are not really mentioned	3	10%
Component 5					
10 100%					
a) project is explicit about partnerships	8	80%			
b) partnerships are somewhat mentioned but not explicit	0	0%			
c) partnerships are not really mentioned	2	20%			

Component Results: Tenure

Component 1			Component 2		
23 100%			17 100%		
a) project is explicit about tenure	10	43%	a) project is explicit about tenure	2	12%
b) tenure is somewhat mentioned but not explicit	1	4%	b) tenure is somewhat mentioned but not explicit	0	0%
c) tenure is not really mentioned	12	52%	c) tenure is not really mentioned	15	88%
Component 3			Component 4		
17 100%			30 100%		
a) project is explicit about tenure	5	29%	a) project is explicit about tenure	8	27%
b) tenure is somewhat mentioned but not explicit	4	24%	b) tenure is somewhat mentioned but not explicit	3	10%
c) tenure is not really mentioned	8	47%	c) tenure is not really mentioned	19	63%

Component 5		
	10	100%
a) project is explicit about tenure	0	0%
b) tenure is somewhat mentioned but not explicit	0	0%
c) tenure is not really mentioned	10	100%

Component Results: Quality of Theory of Change

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">23</th> <th style="text-align: center;">100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how impact is achieved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 1				23	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	6	26%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	10	43%	c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	7	30%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 2</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">17</th> <th style="text-align: center;">100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how impact is achieved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 2				17	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	1	6%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	6	35%	c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	10	59%
Component 1																															
	23	100%																													
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	6	26%																													
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	10	43%																													
c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	7	30%																													
Component 2																															
	17	100%																													
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	1	6%																													
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	6	35%																													
c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	10	59%																													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">17</th> <th style="text-align: center;">100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how impact is achieved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 3				17	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	7	41%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	4	24%	c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	6	35%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 4</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">30</th> <th style="text-align: center;">100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how impact is achieved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 4				30	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	11	37%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	10	33%	c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	9	30%
Component 3																															
	17	100%																													
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	7	41%																													
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	4	24%																													
c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	6	35%																													
Component 4																															
	30	100%																													
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	11	37%																													
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	10	33%																													
c) project does not really say how impact is achieved	9	30%																													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Component 5</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">10</th> <th style="text-align: center;">100%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) project does not really say how (and what) impact is achieved</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component 5				10	100%	a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	1	10%	b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	8	80%	c) project does not really say how (and what) impact is achieved	1	10%																
Component 5																															
	10	100%																													
a) project describes theory of change / impact pathway explicitly	1	10%																													
b) project describes only vaguely how outcomes and impacts are reached,	8	80%																													
c) project does not really say how (and what) impact is achieved	1	10%																													

Component Results: Types of Impact Pathways

Component 1			Component 2		
		23	100%		
a) influencing international or regional policy	0	0%	a) influencing international or regional policy	1	6%
b) influencing national policy	0	0%	b) influencing national policy	0	0%
c) adoption of tangible products	13	57%	c) adoption of tangible products	10	59%
a) and b)	1	4%	a) and b)	1	6%
a) and c)	0	0%	a) and c)	0	0%
b) and c)	9	39%	b) and c)	5	29%
a), b) and c)	0	0%	a), b) and c)	0	0%
Component 3			Component 4		
		17	100%		
a) influencing international or regional policy	0	0%	a) influencing international or regional policy	1	3%
b) influencing national policy	3	18%	b) influencing national policy	4	14%
c) adoption of tangible products	1	6%	c) adoption of tangible products	0	0%
a) and b)	0	0%	a) and b)	6	21%
a) and c)	0	0%	a) and c)	0	0%
b) and c)	8	47%	b) and c)	7	24%
a), b) and c)	5	29%	a), b) and c)	11	38%
Component 5					
		10	100%		
a) influencing international or regional policy	0	0%			
b) influencing national policy	6	60%			
c) adoption of tangible products	1	10%			
a) and b)	2	20%			
a) and c)	0	0%			
b) and c)	1	10%			
a), b) and c)	0	0%			

Component Results: Impact Assessment

<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Component 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">23</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) a baseline study is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) an evaluation is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) both</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) none</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 1			23	100%		a) a baseline study is foreseen	2	9%	b) an evaluation is foreseen	6	26%	c) both	11	48%	d) none	4	17%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Component 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">16</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) a baseline study is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) an evaluation is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) both</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) none</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 2			16	100%		a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%	b) an evaluation is foreseen	6	38%	c) both	6	38%	d) none	4	25%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Component 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) a baseline study is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) an evaluation is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) both</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) none</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 3			17	100%		a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%	b) an evaluation is foreseen	7	41%	c) both	4	24%	d) none	6	35%
Component 1																																																								
23	100%																																																							
a) a baseline study is foreseen	2	9%																																																						
b) an evaluation is foreseen	6	26%																																																						
c) both	11	48%																																																						
d) none	4	17%																																																						
Component 2																																																								
16	100%																																																							
a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%																																																						
b) an evaluation is foreseen	6	38%																																																						
c) both	6	38%																																																						
d) none	4	25%																																																						
Component 3																																																								
17	100%																																																							
a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%																																																						
b) an evaluation is foreseen	7	41%																																																						
c) both	4	24%																																																						
d) none	6	35%																																																						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Component 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">29</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) a baseline study is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) an evaluation is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) both</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) none</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">45%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 4			29	100%		a) a baseline study is foreseen	1	3%	b) an evaluation is foreseen	12	41%	c) both	3	10%	d) none	13	45%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Component 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a) a baseline study is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) an evaluation is foreseen</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) both</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) none</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 5			10	100%		a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%	b) an evaluation is foreseen	3	30%	c) both	2	20%	d) none	5	50%																			
Component 4																																																								
29	100%																																																							
a) a baseline study is foreseen	1	3%																																																						
b) an evaluation is foreseen	12	41%																																																						
c) both	3	10%																																																						
d) none	13	45%																																																						
Component 5																																																								
10	100%																																																							
a) a baseline study is foreseen	0	0%																																																						
b) an evaluation is foreseen	3	30%																																																						
c) both	2	20%																																																						
d) none	5	50%																																																						

Control Question: How adequate was the level of info on the project?

<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Component 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">23</td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inadequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>about right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> <td style="text-align: center;">78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>very adequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 1				23	100%			inadequate	1	5	22%	about right	2	18	78%	very adequate	3	0	0%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Component 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inadequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>about right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>very adequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 2				17	100%			inadequate	1	7	41%	about right	2	10	59%	very adequate	3	0	0%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Component 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inadequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>about right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>very adequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 3				17	100%			inadequate	1	2	12%	about right	2	12	71%	very adequate	3	3	18%
Component 1																																																														
23	100%																																																													
inadequate	1	5	22%																																																											
about right	2	18	78%																																																											
very adequate	3	0	0%																																																											
Component 2																																																														
17	100%																																																													
inadequate	1	7	41%																																																											
about right	2	10	59%																																																											
very adequate	3	0	0%																																																											
Component 3																																																														
17	100%																																																													
inadequate	1	2	12%																																																											
about right	2	12	71%																																																											
very adequate	3	3	18%																																																											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Component 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">28</td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inadequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>about right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>very adequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">46%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 4				28	100%			inadequate	1	5	18%	about right	2	10	36%	very adequate	3	13	46%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Component 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inadequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>about right</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>very adequate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> </table>	Component 5				10	100%			inadequate	1	1	10%	about right	2	8	80%	very adequate	3	1	10%																					
Component 4																																																														
28	100%																																																													
inadequate	1	5	18%																																																											
about right	2	10	36%																																																											
very adequate	3	13	46%																																																											
Component 5																																																														
10	100%																																																													
inadequate	1	1	10%																																																											
about right	2	8	80%																																																											
very adequate	3	1	10%																																																											

Annex E. Synthesis of Performance in Achieving 2012 and 2013 Output Targets

Theme	Jan- Jun 2012	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Dec 2012	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Jun 2013	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Dec 2013	Σ	Σ ₂
6.1.1.1	0	4	0	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	0	4
6.1.1.2	0	11	0	11	11	0	0	7	7	0	0	7
6.1.1.3	1	4	0	5	5	0	0	5	5	0	0	5
6.1.2.1	0	4	0	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	0	4
6.1.2.2	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
6.1.2.3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
6.1.2.4	0	3	0	3	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
6.1.3.1	2	7	2	11	8	3	0	11	16	0	0	7
6.1.3.2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
6.1.3.3	2	2	0	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	0	4
6.1.3.4	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
6.1.4.1	0	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	48	1	3	4
6.2.1.1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1
6.2.1.2	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	0	3
6.2.1.3	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	0	3
6.2.2.1	1	2	1	4	3	1	1	5	0	2	0	2
6.2.2.2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2
6.2.2.3	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
6.2.3.1	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
6.2.3.2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
6.2.3.3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
6.2.4.1	1	0	0	1	16	1	0	0	21	0	0	1
6.3.1.1	0	3	0	3	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	2
6.3.1.2	2	4	0	6	6	1	0	7	1	1	0	2
6.3.1.3	0	5	0	5	4	1	0	5	1	1	0	2
6.3.1.4	3	12	0	15	13	4	0	17	1	1	0	2
6.3.1.5	0	5	0	5	4	1	0	5	1	1	0	2
6.3.2.1	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
6.3.2.2	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	1	0	2
6.3.2.3	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
6.3.2.4	2	3	0	5	4	1	0	5	1	1	0	2
6.3.2.5	3	6	0	9	8	1	0	9	0	2	0	2
6.3.2.6	2	6	0	8	6	2	0	8	0	2	0	2
6.3.3.1	0	4	0	4	3	1	0	4	0	2	0	2
6.3.3.2	1	2	0	3	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	2
6.3.3.3	1	2	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	0	0	1
6.3.3.4	1	2	0	3	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	1
6.3.3.5	0	2	0	2	78	0	2	2	81	0	1	1
6.4.1.1	5	3	1	9	6	3	1	10	2	6	0	8
6.4.1.2	1	3	0	4	2	2	0	4	0	2	0	2
6.4.1.3	2	4	0	6	3	3	0	6	2	4	0	6
6.4.2.1	0	5	0	5	3	3	0	6	4	6	0	10
6.4.2.2	3	2	0	5	4	1	0	5	6	8	0	14
6.4.2.3	1	4	0	5	2	3	0	5	3	6	0	9
6.4.3.1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	2
6.4.3.2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
6.4.3.3	0	1	0	1	38	0	1	0	40	0	2	1
6.5.1.1	5	3	0	8	5	2	0	7	0	2	0	2
6.5.1.2	0	4	0	4	3	1	0	4	1	1	0	2
6.5.1.3	0	3	1	4	3	0	1	4	0	1	0	1
6.5.2.1	1	2	0	3	3	0	0	3	1	2	0	3
6.5.2.2	2	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	0	3	0	3
6.5.2.3	1	2	0	3	25	3	0	3	24	0	2	13

Theme	Jan- Jun 2012	Σ	Jan- Dec 2012	Σ	Jan- Jun 2013	Σ	Jan- Dec 2013	Σ									
FTA Outcome Analysis - Summary	6.1	6	40	2	48	45	3	0	48	6	49	0	55	55	0	0	55
	6.2	5	10	1	16	15	5	1	21	2	14	0	16	11	7	0	18
	6.3	18	60	0	78	65	16	0	81	10	18	0	28	26	2	0	28
	6.4	13	24	1	38	22	17	1	40	18	35	1	54	28	18	1	47
	6.5	9	15	1	25	19	4	1	24	2	11	0	13	8	5	0	13
Σ _{outcome}	51	149	5	205	166	45	3	214	38	127	1	166	128	32	1	161	

Theme	Jan- Jun 2012	Jan- Dec 2012	Jan- Jun 2013	Jan- Dec 2013
6.1	13% 83% 4%	94% 6% 0%	11% 89% 0%	100% 0% 0%
6.2	31% 63% 6%	71% 24% 5%	13% 88% 0%	61% 39% 0%
6.3	23% 77% 0%	80% 20% 0%	36% 64% 0%	93% 7% 0%
6.4	34% 63% 3%	55% 43% 3%	33% 65% 2%	60% 38% 2%
6.5	36% 60% 4%	79% 17% 4%	15% 85% 0%	62% 38% 0%
Σ _{outcome}	25% 73% 2%	78% 21% 1%	23% 77% 1%	80% 20% 1%

completed
on going
delayed
not available

2012 milestones further monitored in Jan-June 2013

	Cross-Cutting	Jan- Jun 2012	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Dec 2012	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Jun 2013	Σ	Σ ₂	Jan- Dec 2013	Σ	Σ ₂
Gender	6.6.1.1	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	6.6.1.2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
	6.6.1.3	3	2	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
S. Landscapes	6.7.1.1	2	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
	6.7.1.2	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	3	0	2	0	2
	6.7.1.3	1	5	0	6	0	5	0	5	0	3	0	3
	6.7.1.4	1	2	0	3	15	0	2	2	11	0	0	0
Communication	6.8.1.1	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2
	6.8.1.2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	6.8.1.3	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	6	0	6
	6.8.1.4	1	2	0	3	10	1	2	0	3	10	2	0
M+E	6.9.1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
	6.9.1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
	6.9.1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTA Outcome Analysis - Summary	Cross-Cutting	Jan- Jun 2012	Σ	Jan- Dec 2012	Σ	Jan- Jun 2013	Σ	Jan- Dec 2013	Σ				
Gender	5	6	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	3
SL	5	10	0	15	1	10	0	11	0	6	0	6	6
Commun.	2	8	0	10	2	8	0	10	3	8	0	11	10
M+E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	7	6
Σ _{outcome}	12	24	0	36	3	18	0	21	7	19	1	27	23

	Cross-Cutting	Jan- Jun 2012	Jan- Dec 2012	Jan- Jun 2013	Jan- Dec 2013
Gender	45% 55% 0%	0% 0% 0%	0% 100% 0%	33% 67% 0%	
SL	33% 67% 0%	9% 91% 0%	0% 100% 0%	67% 33% 0%	
Commun.	20% 80% 0%	20% 80% 0%	27% 73% 0%	91% 9% 0%	
M+E	0% 0% 0%	0% 0% 0%	57% 29% 14%	75% 13% 13%	
Σ _{outcome}	33% 67% 0%	14% 86% 0%	26% 70% 4%	85% 26% 4%	

completed
on going
delayed
not available

Annex F. Sample projects overview

No.	Title	Component	Start/end date	Budget	Lead Center	PI
1	Improving Sustainable Productivity in Farming Systems and Enhanced Livelihoods through Adoption of Evergreen Agriculture in Eastern Africa	1	June 2012 - May 2016	about USD 6 million	ICRAF	Catherine Muthuri
2	Tree Crops Development in Africa and Asia to Benefit the Poor	1 and 2	September 2012 - April 2014	EUR 2 million	ICRAF	Ramni Jamnadass
3	Global Comparative Bush-meat Initiative	1 and 2	2010 - 2013	USD 1.8 million	CIFOR	Robert Nasi, Miguel Pinedo
4	Threats to priority food tree species in Burkina Faso: drivers of resource losses and mitigation measures	2 and Gender	June 2012 - May 2015	USD 0.67 million	CIFOR	CIFOR: Houria Djoudi Biodiversity: Barbara Vinceti
5	Beyond timber: Reconciling the needs of the logging industry with those of forest-dependent people	2	(Conceived in 2008) 2011 - December 2014	EUR 1.530.588 million	Bioversity	Grant Manager: Laura Snook, Project Coordinator: Julius Tieguhong
6	AgFor Sulawesi: Agroforestry and Forestry in Sulawesi: Linking Knowledge with Action	3	2011 - 2016	USD 9.34 million	ICRAF	James Roshetko
7	Building Biocarbon and Rural Development in West Africa (BIODEV)	1, 3 and 4	end of 2012-2016	EUR 10 million	ICRAF	Henry Neufeldt
8	Architecture of REALU: Reducing Emissions for All Land Use (Phase II). Donor NORAD	1, 3 and 4	January 2012 - June 2013	USD 4.76 million	ICRAF	Dr Peter Akong Minang

No.	Title	Component	Start/end date	Budget	Lead Center	PI
9	Gender, Tenure and Community Forest in Uganda and Nicaragua	Gender, (Tenure)		First Phase: EUR 660.161 Second Phase: EUR 765.418	CIFOR	E. Mwangi, A. Larson
10	Global Comparative Study in REDD+	4	2009 - 2018	2013-2016: USD 33.8 million	CIFOR	
11	Chinese trade and investment in Africa: Assessing and governing trade-offs to national economies, local livelihoods and forest ecosystems	5	March 2010 -November 2013	EUR 1.2 million	CIFOR	Luis Putzel
12	Mahogany and teak furniture: action research to improve value chain efficiency and enhance livelihoods	1 (better 5)	2008 - early 2013	USD 1 million	CIFOR	Herry Purnomo
13	Oil palm: Landscapes, market chains and investment flows	SL	June 2013 - December 2013 (preparatory phase)	USD 180 000	CIFOR	Pablo Pacheco
14	PRO-FORMAL: Policy and Regulatory Options to recognize and better integrate the domestic timber sector in tropical countries	5	July 2010 - December 2013	EUR 3.75 million	CIFOR	Paolo Cerutti
15	Adaptation of people to climate change in East Africa: Forest ecosystem services, risk reduction and well-being ("AdaptEA")	4	December 2011 - June 2015	USD 0.658 million	CIFOR	Aaron Russell
16	Informing policy through optimizing timber and non-timber extraction in the Peruvian Amazon	2 and 3	2010-2013	USD 1.5 million	CIFOR	Manuel Guariguata

Annex G. Guidance on governance in the CGIAR context

This annex lists guidance on principles and functions of governance arrangements for global partnership programs in general, of CGIAR BOTs, and of two types of programmatic approaches the CGIAR has tested in earlier years, before summarizing concrete guidance provided on CRP governance structures. This is done for future reference, to ensure prior experience is incorporated into the analysis of this evaluation, and that the ensuring recommendations are derived in a “form follows function” approach.

General principles and functions for global program governance. Governing arrangements of global programs differ widely in structure but usually seek to deliver a similar set of governance functions and aim at adhering to a general set of good governance principles. Useful general guidance for functions and principles of global partnership program governance is provided by an OECD DAC-endorsed evaluation sourcebook (Independent Evaluation Group, 2007) that derives six core functions and seven generally accepted principles of good governance for global partnership programs from the internationally accepted set of OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, taking into account the key differences between Global Partnership Programs and Corporations.¹ This set of general functions and good practice principles of global partnership program governance are listed below.

Typical Governance Functions	Good Governance Principles
Providing strategic direction	Legitimacy
Overseeing management	Accountability
Ensuring stakeholder participation	Responsibility
Management of risk	Fairness
Management of conflicts	Transparency
Overseeing audit and evaluation	Efficiency
	Probity

¹ Namely the absence of tradable shares, the need to establish legitimacy on a basis other than shareholder rights, and the greater need for transparency in the use of public sector resources in achieving public policy goals (Independent Evaluation Group, 2007, p. 72).

A recent IEA CRP governance review, which will be revisited in more detail later in this section, used the same functions and criteria as starting point, and derived a slightly adapted set of functions for a CRP governing.²

Principles and functions of CGIAR Center Governance have been synthesized in the 2007 CGIAR Guidelines on Center Governance (CGIAR Secretariat, 2007) and were also reflected in the governance checklist of the CGIAR's former Performance Management System (PMS). In 2013, an additional checklist for good governance of BOTs was developed as part of the CGIAR Good Governance Framework. Both sets of guidance are extensive – center governance guidelines are probably the most advance governance guidance the CGIAR has developed – and will not be summarized here. However, it should be noted that BOT members serve in independent and personal capacity and have to declare and reclude themselves from discussions and decisions in case of conflict of interest.

Guidance for governance of CGIAR Systemwide and CGIAR Ecoregional Programs (SWEPS).

Two principal types of collaborative programs are subsumed under the acronym SWEP: Systemwide Programs, focused on particular research themes common to a group of Centers, and Ecoregional Programs, focused on sustainable agriculture in specific agro-ecological zones. Sometimes, other system-wide initiatives the CGIAR has entertained are also referred to as SWEPS. Overall, SWEPS varied widely in size, scope and in their governance arrangements.

In 2006, a meta-evaluation of the portfolio of 17 SWEPS reached various overall conclusions and issued four governance-related recommendations. In the same year, the CGIAR Secretariat issued criteria for the assessment of new SWEPS that includes a section on governance and management, to the knowledge of the evaluation team, the closest there is to principles for SWEP governance (SC Secretariat, 2006):

- the program is to be coordinated by an agreed management structure endorsed by Director Generals of the Centers involved in the partnership;
- the arrangements for administrative support (to be provided by one of the core parties) are satisfactory. The Board of each participating Center is accountable for the input resources and delivery of agreed outputs of that core party;

² The CRP governing body's responsibilities should include:

- strategic oversight of the program, including priority setting and the evaluation of results
- overseeing external evaluations of CRP programs and activities
- maintaining awareness of stakeholder perspectives and needs
- serving as the direct report for the CRP leader and conducting an annual performance review (and overseeing the selection process when necessary)
- reporting at least annually to the lead center's board through the lead center board chair or the chair of the board's program committee
- serving as an expert resource to the CRP and the senior management team

- there are clear lines of accountability and clear institutional arrangements spelling out roles, responsibilities, rules of operation, and conflict resolution in a formal agreement signed off at the appropriate legal level by each Program party;
- there are clear and satisfactory arrangements for handling legal responsibilities and there is full adherence to the CGIAR's IPR policy.

Guidance on Challenge Program (CP) governance. The 2007 Charter of the CGIAR defined CPs as follows: “A Challenge Program is a time-bound program of high-impact research that falls within the scope of the CGIAR mission, seeks to resolve complex issues of overwhelming global and/or regional significance (and, if the latter, with global impact), and requires partnerships among a wide range of institutions to develop and deliver its products.”

Overall, five CPs were operated in the CGIAR of which four were externally reviewed, including their governance arrangements. Together with the Science Council, the CGIAR Secretariat published cross-cutting lessons on CPs, including on governance, in 2008 (Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, 2007) and a related set of CP governance principles was endorsed by the CGIAR Executive Committee in the same year (CGIAR Secretariat, 2008; Palenberg, Markus, Institute for Development Strategy, 2008):³

- “set up CPs as non-incorporated, hosted organizations;
- clarify responsibilities between CP and host on the governance and on the operational level;
- avoid unnecessary institutional representation in CP governance but respect legitimate host interests;
- establish an effective vertical chain of command;
- allow for the possibility of governance evolution during the CP’s lifetime.”

It is important to keep two differences between CPs and CRPs in mind. On the one hand, for CPs, independent governance was a definitional requirement with the hope to lower barriers for participation of non-CGIAR institutions. On the other hand, CPs had dedicated funding, i.e. in addition to unrestricted funds passing through the CGIAR system, bilateral donors would usually contribute to the entire CP or to components thereof – in contrast to the situation portrayed for bilateral funding in FTA.

CRP-specific guidance. In the early years of the CGIAR reform, there appears to have been little guidance on functions and good practice principles of CRP governance. However, in February 2011, the Strategy and Results Framework prescribed two basic elements of CRP

³ For the sake of transparency it should be noted that the Team Leader of this evaluation was panel member in three Challenge Program Reviews and tasked to synthesize cross-cutting lessons learnt and to suggest CP governance principles for the 14th meeting of the CGIAR Executive Council.

governance while leaving the approval of the most appropriate governance arrangement for each CRP in the hands of the Consortium Board (CGIAR, 2011, p. 77):

“The Lead Center in consultation with other participating Centers will establish:

- a. a Planning and Management Committee composed of a representative of the Lead Center, a representative of each participating Center, and a representative of other partners that have substantial responsibilities in the implementation of the CRP. This Committee will oversee the planning, management and implementation of the CRP;
- b. a mechanism to ensure that the work in the CRP is of the highest quality; this will usually include a Scientific Advisory Committee composed of individuals who can bring together state-of-the art scientific expertise and insights on strategy, partners, etc. This Committee will advise, report, and be accountable to the Planning and Management Committee.

[...] Since the Consortium Board is ultimately accountable for the efficiency of individual CRPs, it will approve the most appropriate governance arrangement in each particular case taking into consideration the characteristics and specificities of individual CRPs.”

However, it is unclear how this architectural prescription was derived, since no rationale is provided and no reference is made to earlier findings.

Recently, in March 2014, an IEA “Review of CGIAR Research Programs Governance and Management” recommended for each CRP to:

“Create a single, balanced governing body for each CRP that reports directly to the lead center board on the performance of the program. The CRP governance body should bring together appropriate expertise, include a majority of independent expert members, and accommodate lead center and partner representation.”

This recommendation changed the earlier SRF guidance in two ways: it recommends a majority of independent expert members and clarifies that reporting of that extended body should be to the Lead Center BOT.

Annex H. Report of the Panel of Experts

Evaluation of the CGIAR Research Programme “Forests, Trees and Agroforestry” (FTA)

Prepared by Dr. Bhaskar Vira, in collaboration with Dr. Sandra Luque, Dr. Fredrick Owino and Dr. Markku Simula

1. Background

The establishment of an Expert Panel to review the evaluation is part of the quality assurance process of a CRP Evaluation. The Expert Panel was selected by the IEA and is comprised of four external, independent internationally renowned experts from across a range of disciplines related to forestry and agro-forestry. The expert bios are provided at the end of this report.

The purpose of the Expert Panel was to provide impartial technical judgment on the evaluation report, in particular on its findings, conclusions and recommendations, and to provide recommendations to the evaluation Team Leader and the IEA for finalizing the report. Led by the Panel Chair, the expert panel focused on relaying both specific and general comments on the evaluation report. The general comments and feedback were discussed in a webinar among the Panel members, the IEA, the Team Leader, and selected team members. This report synthesizes the individual comments on the draft report made by the Panel members and the webinar’s discussion. It was prepared by the Expert Panel Chair in collaboration with other Panel members.

2. Expert Panel Assessment

2.1 General comments

The evaluation team should be congratulated on their report, in light of the complexity of the subject of the evaluation. FTA is an ambitious programme that cuts across the work of four Centres – CIFOR, ICRAF, Bioversity International and CIAT – and has a long term vision which combines research excellence with developmental impact and innovative partnership arrangements. The review team has delivered well against the Terms of Reference.

The team’s findings are based on evidence and well balanced across the evaluation questions which guided the review. However, the evaluation did not have adequate performance indicators and quantitative assessments of progress, given the scale of overall

investment in FTA; this partly reflects the structure of the programme, rather than any particular shortcomings of the evaluation process itself.

A limitation of the evaluation is that the draft report does not present a long-term vision for the FTA programme. It reads more as a forward-looking mid-term evaluation, rather than analysing the underlying long-term vision of research needs of FTA. Undertaking an evaluation at this stage is a useful way to take stock of experience so far, and to offer thoughts about course correction and changes that might be needed to achieve the goals of the programme. Equally, it would be useful to reflect on the longer-term goals for FTA as a cross-cutting programme.

Some of the recommendations are fairly generic and should be made actionable by providing more “how to” advice. The next stages of this evaluation and review process are not entirely clear, but are likely to involve close consultation with the management team for FTA and the coordinators of the major research themes and cross-cutting activities, as well as senior management of the four Centers that are involved with the delivery of the programme. It would be sensible to use the insights from this report to evolve specific and actionable goals for the programme team(s).

The report is too long and repetitive in places and would benefit from being condensed. The Executive Summary should be shorter and crisper, focusing on the key findings and limiting the narrative to a minimum.

2.2 Relevance

The Evaluation Report should stress the FTA programme’s limited coverage of the “core” forest research that includes forest resource assessment, forest management planning, silviculture, harvesting and utilization. The Lead Centre’s focus on policy oriented research has produced important results, but this area is subject to increasing research activity by a plethora of other international institutions and actors. On the “core” forest research on the other hand, there is no equivalent international body that could carry out strategic international research by forest types. Forestry will face the same challenges as agriculture towards sustainable intensification, which requires constantly improving performance of the world’s forests to provide necessary goods and services. These issues should in principle be dealt with under Component 2, but they are not really within the mandate and resources of the Bioversity International (the new strategy of Bioversity apparently does not make a direct reference to SFM of production forests for multiple uses). This is an important role for FTA, and the evaluation team could highlight this in their report.

The draft report correctly points out that FTA as a programme is weak in dealing with extra-sectoral issues related to forests (water, energy, agriculture and wildlife; these are especially important for mountain forests). It would be worth emphasizing more the missed

opportunity in looking at 'extra-sectoral' issues and synergies and trade-offs, especially in relation to the MDGs/SDGs.

The Evaluation report should also recommend a shift in the focus of Component 3, which appears to be built on the paradigm of the forest and land use transition curve. In fact, it looks like this framework has been adopted for FTA as a whole, which may provide too narrow a view since the framework implicitly disregards the vast areas of forests that are not in the land use change frontier but are in need of sustainable management to enhance their provision of a broad variety of goods and services. This component should work towards adaptive forest management practices to balance multiple objectives under changing environmental conditions at different hierarchical scale levels, from individual sites to the landscape level. Component 3 should focus not only on degraded, fragmented landscapes and restoration, but also on a holistic integrative approach to multifunctional systems. Adaptive management should be at the heart of the programme in order to integrate sustainable agroforestry principles and needs.

The Expert Panel agrees that Component 5 appears to have focused more on mitigation of negative impacts of trade and investment, and that this represents a narrow view on the contribution of FTA activities to sustainable development and in particular poverty reduction. While the recognition of the informal sector in these activities has been strengthened as an FTA research outcome, there is a broader array of strategic research topics related to the potential contribution of FTA activities to economic and social development that has suffered from this narrow focus.

The review team correctly calls for expanding the scope of research into land and forest tenure. However, this will require an additional review of institutions involved with the FTA programme, as there are a number of other centers/organizations with comparative advantages in land and tree tenure research.

The Evaluation Report has an important discussion about the FTA's conceptual model and 'theory of change' (p.50-53), and recommends that this requires careful thought and further development, which the Expert Panel agrees with. Any overall evaluation of the programme will need to consider this theory of change, so this is clearly an important and urgent issue. While relevance from the partners' perspective (including donors) is important, even more important is relevance for the ultimate beneficiaries of FTA research, which must be the core focus for a programme-level theory of change.

Finally the Expert Panel concurs with the reviewers finding that there is too much emphasis on REDD+ research. This is clearly donor-driven and may not be sustained in the medium and long-term.

2.3 Quality of science

The Panel agrees on the need to highlight the lack of expertise on forest economics in the lead Centre, which is rather surprising for an organization considered as a center of excellence for policy-oriented research. As FTA promotes multidisciplinary by definition, this weakness needs to be clearly flagged.

The position of FTA on the issue of access to publication was only marginally addressed in the report. There is a growing consensus that publicly-funded research should be available in forms of open access, and the academic and publishing models that have worked to restrict access to scientific outputs need to be reconsidered. Individual donors and funders who support the FTA institutions often have particular requirements in relation to open access (to outputs, as well as to data and other knowledge products), but the evaluators should comment explicitly on this issue in the evaluation report.

It may be worth highlighting, especially in relation to the FTA's overall theory of change, the role of publication (in the peer review literature) in terms of ultimate development impact. For a programme like FTA, it is important that publication is not seen as an end in itself, but as facilitating the change that is desired in actual policies and practices. This comment could be reinforced within the evaluation report.

2.4 Programme effectiveness

FTA considerably expands the body of forestry and agroforestry related research. At the same time however, the impact pathways of past knowledge remain unclear. This raises the question of whether future research should look into these pathways in a systematic manner rather than leaving it for a theoretical exercise by the Programme. Such research could be a cross-cutting activity to improve effectiveness and cover all the FTA components as the impact pathways are likely to differ between types of research.

The report highlights the challenge of scaling up work that is, by definition, often case study based and location- and/or country-specific. While the report recognizes “mainstreaming” as a critical element for effectiveness, it does not elaborate on options for improving the approach, which appears to rely primarily on communications. Again, a clearer understanding of impact pathways and theories of change would support a more integrated approach to scaling up, across all the partners and participating Centers.

There are some good overall comments and conclusions on programme effectiveness, all well founded on the evidence and proposing sensible ways forward for FTA. While these observations are important, the comment by the evaluation team about “the limits of what research findings can contribute to ultimately very complex political decision-making processes” (p.71) is worth keeping in mind in any discussion of theories of change and programme effectiveness. The review team's conclusions on a pragmatic approach in developing indicators and monitoring appear sound, in this context.

2.5 Cross-cutting activities

2.5.1 Sentinel landscapes

The Expert Panel agrees with the reviewers' observations about the risks with the Sentinel Landscapes activities, and their overall added value to FTA. It is not clear that this needs to be a continued strategic priority for FTA, without careful review and justification. In the long run, responsibilities for data collection and analysis must rest with national research institutions, rather than perpetuating such landscapes as 'international research stations'.

The Panel particularly shares the views of the reviewers that there are risks of (i) lack of sustained involvement of host government authorities in capacity building for the Sentinel Landscapes project and (ii) lack of donor or other funding support in the long-term for 'data observatories'.

The Expert Panel therefore believes that the Evaluation should strengthen its recommendations and be more explicit about the need for a strong business case for continued investment in Sentinel Landscapes on the part of FTA.

2.5.2 Capacity development

The draft report identifies capacity development as more of a Centre-based activity, rather than cutting across FTA as a whole, and appropriately suggests that a broader approach across the Centers might provide considerable opportunities and synergies. The conclusions on capacity development of the Evaluation Team are fully supported but, given the importance of capacity development for delivery, the issues should be addressed in a recommendation either in Recommendation 4 dealing with boundary partners as a whole, or in an explicit recommendation on Capacity Development.

The role of, and relationship with, country-level institutions for capacity development could be further highlighted. While external research by international organizations remains important, it is increasingly important for this research to reflect and work with national level priorities and institutions, and the report could include some specific comments in relation to this issue.

2.6 Value added of FTA

The interface with other CRPs, notably CRPs 5 on Water, Land and Ecosystems and 7 on Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security were not explored – synergies within these CRPs could be sought in order to increase the value added of FTA.

The report could comment further on the role of national FTA research institutions, and how a programme like CRP-FTA could potentially increase the influence and credibility of in-country research.

The Expert Panel agrees with the overall conclusion of the review team that the huge potential of CRP-FTA is yet to be realized – this is seen as a constructive, mid-term evaluation of work so far, and a challenge to the FTA team to deliver on the considerable promise (and investment) associated with the programme.

3. Annex – Members of the Expert Panel

Dr Bhaskar Vira (Chair)

Director, University of Cambridge Conservation Research Institute & Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography. Bhaskar is chairing the recently formulated IUFRO-led Global Forest Expert Panel on Forest and Food Security.

Dr. Vira is trained as an economist, and works on the political economy of environment and development. He supervises a group of doctoral research students working in the Society, Environment and Development Research Cluster in the Department of Geography. Dr. Vira is particularly interested in incentives for natural resource use and management, state-society interactions over natural resources, and multi-stakeholder partnerships for natural resource management. His research has been supported by, among others, the Wellcome Trust, the Nuffield Foundation and NERC-ESRC-DFID's Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) program. He was a coordinating lead author for the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the UK National Ecosystem Assessment.

Dr. Sandra Luque

Research Director at IRSTEA - National Research Institute of Science and Technology for Environment and Agriculture, France

Dr. Luque is a landscape ecologist whose research interests cover a broad range of areas that include geography, ecology, global change (terrestrial ecosystems), landscape change dynamics, biodiversity indicators and conservation and management of natural resources, in particular forests. Her interests and experience focuses on spatial heterogeneity and landscape patterns and its implications for communities, and ecosystem processes. The main focus of her research is on spatio-temporal dynamics and disturbances at the landscape level. Within this context, Dr. Luque emphasizes the key role that the human dimension imprints on both, obvious and subtle impacts on ecosystems.

Dr. Luque is currently a senior visiting scholar at the University of St Andrews and has previously worked as a Senior Research Scientist with the METLA Finnish Forest Inventory Research Institute. She was also a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Cambridge and a professional Consultant with UNCTAD.

Dr. Fredrick Owino

Managing Director, Forest Resources International, Kenya

Professor Fredrick Owino has a long career in forestry research and higher education in East Africa. He has served as the head of the Department of Forestry, University of Nairobi in the 1970's, as the dean of the Faculty of Forest Resources and Wildlife Management of Moi University in the 1980's, and as scientist at the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) in the 1990's. After that he has accomplished a wide range of short-time consultancy assignments in several African countries, and served as negotiator for international agreements on forests. In 2014, Professor Owino was appointed as Honorary Doctor by the University of Helsinki.

His research focuses on Forestry education and training, tree improvement research, forest policy, integrated natural resources management, and forest and wildlife conservation.

Dr. Markku Simula

University of Helsinki, Adjunct Professor of Forest Economics, Finland

Dr. Markku Simula is an international specialist on the economics of forestry and forest industries, policy analysis, sectoral and corporate planning and environmental management in the forestry sector.

Simula has more than 30 years of experience of international consulting and research work for international organizations, multilateral development banks, government agencies and

the private sector. He has headed several large forestry projects in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America, and held posts in international forestry organisations and professional affiliations. Dr. Simula served as the Chief Executive Officer of Indufor Oy in 1980-2003 and has since then worked as an independent consultant.

Simula worked for ECA/FAO Forest Industries Advisory Group in Addis Abeba as Forest Industries Marketing Expert in 1974-76. Since then he has carried out several consulting assignments for FAO including on forest degradation, forest definitions, certification and other policy work.