<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>References in SPPC doc</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>Provide a clear definition of how PIM will perform an integrating role in the portfolio. Value-added by PIM needs to be identified in a single concise and compelling statement. Within CGIAR this is defined as making sure policy recommendations from different CRPs are coherent and providing broadly applicable social science methods and tools, such as shared approaches to foresight modeling and global data bases.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 1 Needs improvement p. 2 Specific comments p. 5 Specific comments p. 6</td>
<td>See statement about PIM’s integrative functions in executive summary and overview (summary narrative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>Show how PIM will adopt a systems-based approach and integrate its research products and process with agrifood systems CRPs. The added value from the PIM flagships needs to be better defined in terms of what policy research the AFS programs need from PIM in order to deliver, rather than in terms of what PIM is prepared to do. Integrate a modern food systems perspective with clear linkages to outcomes in the AFS programs is recommended.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 1 Needs improvement p. 2 Specific comments p. 4 Specific comments p. 6</td>
<td>See new language about this in sections on PIM’s portfolio and comparative advantage (summary narrative). To the extent possible at this early stage, demand from the AFS CRPs has been reflected in PIM’s flagship narratives; e.g., the Flagship 3 writing team (with participation of many Centers/CRPs) has clarified PIM’s comparative advantage and value added vis-a-vis the AFS CRPs; more policy research on seed systems has been integrated into Cluster 1.2 in response to demand from AFS CRPs. Linkages with AFS CRPs at cluster level are described in Annex II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>There needs to be a more cogent explanation of how different PIM Flagships work together For improved program-level coherence, the rationale for how PIM’s “six inter-related flagships” work together to make a program needs more clarity: in PIM’s impact pathway and in the presentation of each flagship, there is little reference to the other PIM flagships. Figure (p.5 of the document general document) does not show the relationships between the flagships and their clusters. As a result, the flagships come across as independent silos.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 1 Specific comments p. 5</td>
<td>See new language about this in section on PIM’s portfolio (summary narrative). Linkages between flagships have been strengthened throughout the document, including each of the flagship narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>References in SPPC doc</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>Address IEA’s recommendation about setting up a research program on the interface between science and policy.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 2</td>
<td>See description of Cluster 2.3 in Flagship 2 narrative. The new line of research on the political economy of the policy process has also been highlighted in the executive summary and in the section on PIM’s portfolio (summary narrative). Note that the Flagship 2 narrative includes an offer to host a community of practice on this topic, if there is interest from other CRPs/centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>Explain more precisely how PIM will tackle the SRF priority to enable markets and institutions to better deliver critical public goods and services.</td>
<td>Needs improvement p. 2</td>
<td>PIM provides a leading contribution to the cross-cutting IDO ‘Enabling environment’, both at global and national level. This is emphasized both in the narrative (sections on PIM’s impact pathways in summary narrative, and flagship narratives) and in the Performance Indicators Matrix. Most flagships support global policy processes (e.g. Flagship 1 on increasing investment in agricultural R&amp;D in developing countries, Flagship 2 on the youth employment agenda, Flagship 3 on addressing global market distortions, Flagship 5 on supporting major tenure policy reforms led by the Africa Union Commission). PIM’s contribution to an enabling environment at national level will focus on a selected number of CGIAR countries of collaboration. The specific research agenda as well as the appropriate mechanisms for supporting policy in these countries will be developed following the country consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP role and structure</td>
<td>Flagship 4 does not make a convincing case for CGIAR investment in research on social protection although IFPRI has a long-standing niche and a top-class reputation for its past in this research area: this is a compartmentalized, legacy topic</td>
<td>Specific comments p. 6</td>
<td>Justification for PIM’s work on social protection strengthened in Flagship 4 narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E, IPs and ToCs</td>
<td>No discussion of the CRP’s RBM Framework, M&amp;E, learning, etc. The one ToC in the Draft is quite weak, and doesn’t contain all the components of a ToC.</td>
<td>Specific comments p. 5</td>
<td>Description of PIM’s approach to M&amp;E and RBM strengthened in section on budget and value for money, and highlighted in executive summary. Section on PIM’s impact pathways (summary narrative) strengthened. A diagram representing impact pathways at the flagship level along with a brief description of these is included in each flagship narrative. Due to space limitations it is not possible to include full description of risks and assumptions related to the theories of change at the flagship level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>References in SPPC doc</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Better explain how lessons learned will be used.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 1 Specific comments p. 3</td>
<td>See sections on lessons learned in each flagship narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and partnerships</td>
<td>Deepen the style or type of partnership with national institutions: demonstrate some solid NARS partnerships (as distinct from NARS as end users) with NARIs, national governments, land use and water planning bodies, federations of farmers’ organizations etc.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 1 Needs improvement p. 2 Specific comments p. 3</td>
<td>More references to partnerships with national structures incorporated in section on PIM’s partnerships (summary narrative) and in flagship narratives. However, please note that PIM does not have the same types of research partnerships with NARS as the AFS CRPs, because policy research in NARS is generally weak in priority countries for PIM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and partnerships</td>
<td>Address IEA’s recommendation about formulation of an explicit capacity strengthening strategy.</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 2 Needs improvement p. 2</td>
<td>See section on capacity development (summary narrative). This strategy is being developed jointly with the Lead Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Address IEA’s recommendation about inclusion of a greater diversity of scholarly disciplines to expand the choice of research topics, designs, and methods</td>
<td>Synthesis p. 2 Needs improvement p. 2</td>
<td>Added mention of expertise of core flagship teams in diversity of disciplines besides economics in section on comparative advantage (summary narrative). Also refer to Annex V (CVs of core team members).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Whereas the IEA has encouraged PIM to “consider having representatives of the participating Centers as well as independent members on the Steering Committee that would have greater than their numerical say in the allocation of W1-2 resources. The IFPRI Board of Trustees should delegate programmatic responsibility to the Steering Committee while retaining the fiduciary responsibility for ensuring that the W1-2 funds are used for their intended purposes” (p. xv), PIM is proposing to replace the Science and Policy Advisory Panel by an Independent Steering Committee composed of eminent scientists and policy advisers from outside the CGIAR, which will review the strategic management of the program. Why is PIM not following the recommendation of the IEA?</td>
<td>Specific comments p. 7</td>
<td>With regard to this point, see Management Response to the PIM evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>References in SPPC doc</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>The PIM budget is $100m per year. This looks expensive for a program carrying no in-house laboratory or experiment station infrastructure and sharing the cost of IFPRI’s Washington DC installation with another CRP, A4NH. For comparison, GRiSP (IRRI) requests about 130m year. At $1m annually, cross cutting partnerships and capacity building look seriously under-resourced. Elsewhere it is stated that PIM has in the past used about 25% of budget for co-investment. For comparison GRiSP estimates coinvestment with other CRPs at $12-18m annually.</td>
<td>Specific comments p. 7</td>
<td>We disagree with the comment on the overall budget. The comparison made does not take into account the demand for PIM’s research from within and outside CGIAR, its potential impact, and its contribution to the SLO targets. Capacity building and partnerships are part of each flagship’s budget in addition to the cross-cutting budget lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competency</td>
<td>No list of team members or CVs provided</td>
<td>Specific comments p. 7</td>
<td>CVs are provided in Annex V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>